

THE

ECLECTIC REVIEW.

DECEMBER, 1849.

ART. I.—1. *The Church and the State; or, a Brief Apology for the Church of England in her Connexion with the State.* By the Rev. Tilson Marsh, M.A. In reply to ‘An Essay on the Union of the Church and the State.’ By the Hon. and Rev. B. W. Noel, M.A. London: Hatchard and Son. 1849.

2. *A Word for the Church; with Remarks on the Hon. B. W. Noel's Essay on the Union of Church and State.* By Thomas Boys, M.A., Minister of the Wenlock Church. London: Jackson. 1849.

3. *A Reply to the Hon. and Rev. B. W. Noel's Essay on the Union of Church and State.* By the Rev. Clotworthy Gillmor. London: Painter. 1849.

4. *The British Quarterly Review, February, 1849.*

5. *The North British Review, February, 1849.*

6. *The Christian Reformer; or, Unitarian Magazine and Review, April, 1849.*

7. *The Wesleyan Methodist Association Magazine, March, 1849.*

8. *The Scottish Presbyterian Magazine, March, 1849.*

9. *The English Presbyterian Messenger, February, 1849.*

THE secession of Mr. Noel from the Anglican Church, and his profession of the principles of Evangelical Dissent, in the latter part of the year 1848, naturally excited the deepest interest, both within and without the pale of the Establishment. Such a

course was not, indeed, altogether unexpected by those who had attentively watched his public career, and who were acquainted with the manliness and simplicity of his nature, and the catholicity and decision of his character. Still the event itself was impressive. A man whose varied attainments, and unusual ministerial qualifications, have, for twenty-two years, constituted him one of the brightest ornaments of his denomination ; a chaplain of her Majesty, and the brother of a peer, could not publicly withdraw from the Established Church, without attracting to himself, however unwillingly, the intensest interest of the public ; and we readily anticipated that it would elicit from the ranks which he quitted, the strongest expressions of animadversion and remonstrance.

This expectation was heightened in our own minds by the simultaneous announcement of the publication of his reasons for this step, in a work entitled, 'An Essay on the Union of Church and State ;' and we were led to anticipate some apologies for that union in reply, from the pens of its ablest and most renowned adherents, which would supersede the more ancient and standard defences of the Anglican Church, and constitute, henceforth, the text-book of the religious Protectionist.

A careful perusal, however, of Mr. Noel's 'Essay' greatly modified this expectation. The known fact that so much of biblical and historical research, of intellectual power, and logical acumen, had been of late devoted by the more eminent and earnest Nonconformists, to the great questions at issue between themselves and their ecclesiastical opponents, forbade us to anticipate in the pages of Mr. Noel much that was absolutely new ; except, indeed, with relation to some points of hierarchical law and discipline, with which his past position would specially acquaint and familiarize him. In this, indeed, we were not mistaken, but we rose from the perusal of the 'Essay' with a strong opinion that a reply to it was not likely to be undertaken by men of high standing and matured observation, but only by those more youthful aspirants for promotion, who hail the opportunity of leading the forlorn hope. In vain does the Church summon the bishop or the dean, in language familiar to each at Eton or Westminster,—

‘ I, bone, quo virtus tua te vocat ; I, pede fausto
Grandia latus meritorum præmia ! Quid stas ? ’

The reply is as certain as an echo :—

‘ “ Ibit eo quo vis, qui zonam perdidit,” inquit.’

On a re-examination of Mr. Noel's work, we feel bound to say that for the comprehensiveness of its range, for the absolute

conclusiveness of its arguments, for the classic purity and unostentatious beauty of its style, for its deep and various research, and for the candour and winning loveliness of its spirit, it stands—and in the last-mentioned attribute, unhappily, almost alone—in the very highest rank of our polemical literature. If, irrespectively of the merits of this question, Mr. Noel's 'Essay' had only afforded so matchless a model of religious controversy, that of itself would have been sufficient to secure to him the gratitude and admiration of the whole Christian world.

Mr. Macaulay, in one of his elaborate articles in the 'Edinburgh Review,' remarks, as characteristic of the Anglican clergy, a want of intellectual expansion and logical power, which he attributes to their having spent, in the English universities, those years in which the human mind ordinarily makes its most rapid advances, in pursuits whose natural tendency is to cramp their energies, and to stereotype their opinions. With comparatively few exceptions, we think the observation respecting the clergy a just one, though we should attribute the phenomenon less to a confined and almost mediæval range of study, than to the fetters of creed and test, which forbid all independence of thought, by rendering it highly prejudicial to the secular prospects of the student. Still, we confess, we were unprepared to find in the 'Replies' which Mr. Noel's 'Essay' has called forth such a mass of truisms and platitudes, and so prevalent an air of narrowness and debility of intellect. An intelligent reader would suppose that the subject was new to the authors; so that they do not even make the best of a bad case. By far the largest and best portion of Mr. Noel's production is evaded without an attempt at refutation. Some of his clearest delineations of the evils which necessarily result from the union are dismissed with a single page of tame and irrelevant commonplace; while in attempting, in apparent good faith, to do justice to Mr. Noel's positions, they not unfrequently miss the point of his reasoning, and misunderstand its tendency.

It should be said to the honour of most of the writers before us, that their productions are marked by a more than respectful courtesy towards the author of the 'Essay,' which shows that, however they may fail to appreciate the conclusiveness of his arguments, they are fully capable of feeling the charm which his noble and ingenuous nature has thrown over the pages of his book. To this rule we regret to notice one lamentable exception. We refer to the production of a Mr. Clotworthy Gillmor; and as we do not intend to gratify that most nauseous person by any further notice of himself or his performance, we will dismiss him by assigning two reasons for this course. The first is, that we consider it due to the many excellent members of the Anglican

Church, whom he impudently affects to represent, to give no further publicity to that indecent and shocking ribaldry which will doubtless call a blush to their faces whenever they hear his name. The second is the result of common self-respect, and of a seemly care for the reputation of the 'Eclectic Review.' We had hoped that the Church of England was only disgraced by one L. S. E.; but we find, with astonishment, that there is in the lowest deep a lower deep, and at that *nadir* of Christian civilization is the dull abode of Mr. Clotworthy Gillmor. We could not characterise either him or his book without a circuitousness of language, which would be detected at once as an ungainly striding to step clear of some well-known Saxon epithets, which lie directly in our path. Let it suffice to say, that we challenge any one to mention a single work, in the whole range of controversy, disgraced by such profound ignorance, such stolid obtuseness, and such *infra*-plebeian vulgarity. If he thinks to wriggle his way to preferment by such means as these, his estimate of the Church, and, most certainly, of the State, is infinitely lower than either Mr. Noel's or our own. He forcibly reminds us of the little insect, immortalized in the apostrophe of Burns:—

' We canna say but he struts rarely
O'er gauze and lace,
Though faith we think he'll *dine but sparingly*
On sic a place.'

There is much in the unpretending treatise of Mr. Boys to disarm the severity of criticism: yet so loose are its statements, and so oblique and powerless is its reasoning, that we cannot imagine any unprejudiced reader deeming it worthy of the name of a reply to the 'Essay on the Union of Church and State.' The author indicates, *in limine*, the trammels under which he is held:—

' When,' he says, ' we are admonished of a state of things so thoroughly bad, that there is no hope from internal amendment; of evils so inveterate, that they must last as long as the system; and of principles so unsound, that there is no course but to come out from the national Church and be separate; it can hardly be matter of surprise if we subject such statements to cautious scrutiny. To a clergyman, especially, it is a serious question how far he ought lightly to entertain every objection that may be urged against the system to which he is pledged; how far it is a matter of option to be diverted from the discharge of duties solemnly undertaken, by cavils, by denunciations, or by theories. Should doubts and difficulties so far influence his mind, as to suggest the expediency of securing leisure for examination by a temporary retirement from the active duties of his calling, he must surely feel that

even such retirement, while it lasts, is an interruption of that 'faithful diligence,' in his allotted service, to which he bound himself when he received authority to minister in the congregation.'

This is an ominous commencement. The tendency of such observations is not only to perpetuate error and abuse, but to silence the voice, and annul the claims of conscience itself. Even Dr. Paley, at once the most lax and the most entertaining of moralists, whose works most clergymen will recollect as their university text-book, clearly shows that no vows are binding, the fulfilment of which is conscientiously felt to involve dishonesty. Now this is precisely Mr. Noel's case, and this writer reflects on the practical course which it dictates by making 'inveterate evils and unsound principles,' in the former part of the paragraph, correspond with 'cavils, denunciations, and theories, in the latter ; though why the word 'theories' should be introduced, assuming that the writer understands the meaning of the term, we are at a loss to imagine. Surely there is such a thing as the theory of a christian and apostolic church ; and if the principles of any existing communion are grossly inconsistent with that theory, surely a Christian man may withdraw from it without exposing himself to the charge of having been influenced by 'cavils and denunciations.' But Mr. Boys denies to the inquiring clergyman even the privilege of 'a temporary' retirement from the active duties of his calling for the purpose of a thoughtful examination of the subject ; this being 'an interruption' of that 'faithful diligence' to which he has bound himself. As if a clergyman could not thoughtfully review his position without retiring from his charge ; and as if it were better that he should continue in an anti-christian course than that he should ascertain whether it be, or be not, in accordance with the will of his Master.

The views of Mr. Boys upon the general subject which he undertakes to treat, have little, we fear, but their novelty to recommend them. Indeed, we have rarely met with anything more crude and ill-defined. The foundation-stone of his argument is thus laid in the first paragraph of his book. 'England, once Roman Catholic, at the Reformation became Protestant. The change was national. Romanists viewed it with abhorrence ; nor did it wholly satisfy the fathers of Nonconformity. But, effected by ecclesiastical and legislative authority, demanded by the exigencies of the times, and adopted by the community, the Reformation must be regarded as a national act.' All this we must designate as historical error. England did not, except in the most loose and nominal sense, become Protestant at the Reformation ; nor was the change in any sense national ; nor can the Reformation be regarded as a national act ; nor was it effected

by ecclesiastical authority, nor even by any legislative authority that deserves the name. The Reformation in England, so far from being the act of the nation, and rendered necessary by a matured and decided public opinion, was instigated by the crimes, and achieved by the will, of the monarch—a man of whom Sir James Macintosh observes, with equal wit and truth, that he approached 'as nearly to the ideal standard of perfect wickedness, as the infirmity of human nature would admit.' The nation was not represented, and consequently had no voice in the matter. It was in fact rather a transfer of church property, than a moral transition ; and little surprise need therefore be felt that the steps of this revolution were subsequently retraced, or that to this moment the constitution of the Anglican Church should include some of the most essential principles of Popery ; its apostolical succession, its sacramental efficacy, its priesthood, and its pomp. The author admits that the Romanists viewed the change with abhorrence, and adds, with truistic tameness, that it did not *wholly satisfy* the fathers of nonconformity. Assuredly it did not ; and coupling these masses of the malcontent people with the well-known conduct of Henry VIII., we are at a loss to know what Mr. Boys means by his assertion that the Reformation was a 'national act,' and a 'national change.'

We should have deemed the errors thus put forth too obvious to be dwelt upon, had not the writer made them the basis of a still more startling theory, viz., that in consequence of the legal integrity, and the popular unanimity which marked this change, the Church and the State must thenceforth be regarded as absolutely identical. There is something so puzzling in this proposition, that on first perusing the earlier pages of Mr. Boys's treatise, we imagined that we must be misapprehending his meaning. The citation of a few passages, however, from the work itself, will make it clear that this is precisely what he maintains. 'The original idea,' he says (page 3), 'in conformity with which our Church acquired the character which it still retains, was not that of union, but that of identity. In other words, the Protestant Church of England was not originally a detached body, and afterwards annexed to the State—which would be union ; it was the State itself constituting itself a Protestant Church. First, there was a national change of religion ; then, as the natural consequence, the religion took the form of the National Establishment. This was no mere union, if by union we are to understand simply the uniting of a Church and State previously existing apart. The State was the Church, and the Church was the State.' And again (p. 4, 5), 'Church and State then viewed in their general character, are not united merely, but identical. We are not assuming that this, because

it is so, ought to be. We ask only that a plain matter-of-fact may be correctly viewed.' Hence Mr. Boys takes serious exception against the title of Mr. Noel's Essay on the *Union* of Church and State; and after citing various passages in which that gentleman condemns the interference and control exercised by the State in spiritual affairs, he adds (p. 22), 'a few plain words will set all this straight. The State having adopted the Reformed faith, arranges its own ecclesiastical polity, ministry, ritual, &c., all the individuals comprehended in this arrangement being members of the State. The State in acting thus, merely exercises the right of *self-government*. The State having *constituted itself* the Church, the Church, in conforming itself to State regulations, is subject to no extraneous control.'

We pay Mr. Boys a very equivocal compliment when we declare ourselves a little at a loss to reply to this first and most important chapter of his book. Our difficulty is purely logical. It is just that which is felt in an attempt to demonstrate an axiom, or to refute a contradiction in terms. 'The Church and the State,' says Mr. Boys, 'are absolutely identical.' Were then Charles II. and George IV. ministers of religion? Is the living contrast to these who now fills the throne a priestess *ex officio*? Is the Archbishop of Canterbury an abstraction, and his title a mere pendant in the name and style of the monarch? Does Mr. Boys seriously mean that the Catholics, Puseyites, Quakers, Methodists, Congregationalists, and we fear we must add, infidels and profligates, who occupy the seats of the upper and lower Houses of Parliament, actually constitute the Anglican Church? If he does not mean this he means nothing. If he does, his statements and the argument built upon them are palpably and ludicrously absurd.

It is almost unnecessary to say that no other opponent of Mr. Noel makes the slightest approach to this strange hallucination of Mr. Boys. They all recognise the essential distinctness of political and ecclesiastical establishments.

'There are,' says Mr. Tilson Marsh, 'three different forms of State-connexion with the Church. Firstly, there is the national recognition of religion. This is when the State, as a State, professes to hold some particular creed, and to sustain some special form of public worship. This was the case in England during the early days of the Heptarchy, in certain of the Saxon kingdoms. Secondly, there is the endowment of the Church by the State, in which case the State apportions certain monies or estates to the use of the Church for ever, which property of the Church is ever afterwards under the protection of the law. Thirdly, there is the establishment of the Church, in which case the State guarantees not only past gifts, but also present payments, to the clergy, and in return requires that the country shall be territorily divided, and a pastor assigned by the Church to each territorial division. The second is the system under which our Universities have been

founded, and some of our great public schools. The third is instanced in the Churches of England, Ireland, and Scotland.'—*The Church and State*, pp. 197, 198.

'There is nothing of "Erastianism,"' says another of Mr. Noel's clerical opponents, 'in our enjoying all this protection and favour from the State: it is an honour to the State to afford it.' . . . 'We are allied to the State, but the State has no part in any of our Church's ministerial functions. We hold all sacred offices in our own hands.' When we consider the sources from which ecclesiastical dignity and patronage are conferred, we are almost as much confounded by this last statement, as by the outrageous position of Mr. Boys himself. But we must leave these reverend gentlemen to settle their differences among themselves.

The reply to Mr. Noel's Essay by the Rev. Tilson Marsh, occupies no less than 457 pages, and after perusing it, we must say with much weariness, we are convinced that four-fifths of it might be expunged without the sacrifice of anything really relevant to its design as a reply to the Essay.

Mr. Marsh commences by laying down several cardinal propositions as the basis of his reply to Mr. Noel, and as these involve a variety of popular fallacies, we shall notice them in succession, and with the utmost possible brevity. The first is in the following words: ' "Jehovah is the fountain of civil power." "There is no power but of God." "The powers that be are ordained by God." Our Lord, as the Son of man, is the head of the Church. His kingdom is at present subordinate to the government of Jehovah.'

If, by the former part of this paragraph, Mr. Marsh intends that civil government in general is of divine ordination, we have nothing to object; but if he adopts the vulgar notion, that the powers that be are individually ordained of God, and have the plenary authority which must flow from such an appointment, we deny his position altogether. Surely no Christian man can thoughtfully claim such distinction and such powers for Nero and Domitian, for Archbishop Laud, Judge Jeffries, and Robespierre, especially in matters of religion, to which Mr. Marsh's postulate obviously refers. In a word, the demands of conscience, whatever sufferings may be incurred by obedience to them, must be regarded by every Christian man as anterior and paramount to all State regulation. We are glad to find Mr. Marsh asserting that Jesus Christ is the head (by which we presume he means the only head) of the Church. This statement will doubtless be greatly valued by that portion of the community, the staple article of whose spiritual diet is the doctrine that this prerogative has been transferred to the reigning monarch. Such persons will, doubtless, rejoice in their promotion from the humbler to the tran-

scendently higher service. ‘The kingdom of Christ,’ says Mr. Marsh, in conclusion, ‘is at present subordinate to the government of Jehovah.’ These words introduce a purely theological and irrelevant question. The words of our Lord are, ‘all power is given unto me in heaven and on earth.’

Mr. Marsh’s second proposition is as follows: ‘Jehovah established, in the old time, a Church in connexion with the State, therefore the principle of the connexion is not unlawful.’ The obvious reply to this is, that everything is unlawful in the Christian Church which is not according to the will of Christ. If such a connexion was repealed by the Christian dispensation, as we contend it was, it is, so far as we are concerned, unlawful. The author might as well cite the Six-Mile Act, the Conventicle Act, and the Test and Corporation Acts, and argue on the same grounds the propriety of enforcing them in the present day. A full reply to this proposition would necessitate the insertion of a considerable portion of Paul’s Epistle to the Hebrews.

The above observations equally apply to Mr. Marsh’s third canon. ‘Our Lord Jesus Christ was a member of that Church in its latter days; and so, also, were his apostles.’ A further inquiry, however, seems to be naturally suggested here. Does Mr. Marsh mean that our Lord did not repeal the Jewish dispensation?—that he left it just as he found it? Does he mean that the apostles maintained the Jewish economy, recognised its priesthood, obeyed its ritual, admitted its authority, and offered its oblations? What mean the apostolic monitions against Judaizing teachers, and a return ‘to the beggarly elements’ of a past and superseded dispensation? We can only say that if Mr. Marsh does not mean what these questions imply, he writes in a language which we are unable to understand.

Fourthly, says Mr. Marsh, ‘every professedly Christian man, who is, or who is not a civil ruler, is bound, by the word of God, to honour and to worship God, and also to use all the means afforded to him for the promotion of the well-being of his fellow-men for time and for eternity.’

If this paragraph is only intended to mean what is strictly implied in its terms we have nothing whatever to object to it. The tenor of the book, however, convinces us, that the author’s true meaning extends far beyond this, and may perhaps be illustrated by the following paragraph from the number of the ‘North British Review,’ now before us:—

‘Religion we hold to be a fair subject for legislation—but not the Church. And here we are surely entitled to look for a general agreement among the friends of truth. It cannot really be held by any right-minded Christian that Government has nothing to do with religion. That sentiment has been distinctly, and, we believe, heartily

repudiated by many who are anxious to be accounted Voluntaries. Let it then be granted, on the one side, that the Christian ruler is bound, *in his official character*, to regulate himself by Christian principles, to do all in his power for the advancement of the truth; and that *it is the duty of nations* to own the authority of the highest Lord. Let us no more hear such Pilate-like questions started as—What is truth? or, Who is to be the judge of it? Then is the way open for the admission, on the other side, that though religion, as being common to both Church and State, ought to be recognised by the latter as the best friend of man, and the firmest pillar of society, yet the Church, as being a spiritual and independent kingdom, cannot be legislated for by another kingdom, further than to have her independence acknowledged and settled by law. In this simple distinction between religion and the Church—between the divine life and the organized body—may not a *via media* be found on which the friends of Christ may yet join hands and keep step in the march of Christian freedom? And may not even the vexed question of endowments be settled among them, theoretically, on the same amicable terms? What repels and alarms the one party here, is not merely the elevation by the other of the mere mode of supporting the pastors into a Christian ordinance, which it must be sinful to violate, but such assertions as that the endowment of truth and of error are equally sinful, and that in no case may Government grant supplies of money for religious purposes. But few will deny that, in certain states of society, the endowment of any one corporation of Christians may become highly inexpedient; and the question of support might be made to rest on the duty of maintaining the independence of the Church.'—Pp. 352, 353.

This paragraph may be comprehended as including the whole theoretical argument of the exponent of the Free Church of Scotland against Mr. Noel's Essay. We confess to some surprise at finding it introduced into an article otherwise distinguished by ability and candour of spirit; and as the subject of it is fundamentally important, and the fallacies it involves very plausible and very prevalent, we shall pause to give to it a brief, but attentive consideration. 'Religion,' says the writer, 'is a fair subject for legislation, but not the Church.' Now, by the Church, here one of two things must be meant. Either a distinct corporation, with assignable rights, claims, properties, and obligations; or, secondly, the visible embodiment of a certain system of theological principles. Now, surely, in the second particular, the State cannot legislate upon religion without directly affecting and legislating for the Church; while, in the other aspect of the Church, as a corporation with property and prerogative, in which alone it can come under the action of law, the writer holds it inviolable by the hands of the State. Indeed, it is difficult to understand what the writer means by legislating on religion, as distinct from a legal interference with Churches; with this reservation nothing appears to us to be left, but to make theological

dogmas the subject of acts of parliament ;—to enact, for example, the universal practice of adult baptism, or to repeal the doctrine of final perseverance. This of course cannot be the meaning of the writer ; yet we confess ourselves unable to see what other legislative course he can contemplate.

But the more prevalent fallacy lies in the following passage : 'It cannot really be held by any right-minded Christian, that Government has nothing to do with religion ; let it then be granted that the Christian ruler is bound, in his *official character*, to regulate himself by Christian principles, to do all in his power for the advancement of the truth, and that *it is the duty of nations* to own the authority of the highest Lord.' Here we have an illustration of the logical error known as the *non sequitur*. We readily admit that members of the Government have to do with religion ; and that, in the words of Mr. Marsh, whether a man be or be not a civil ruler, he is bound to honour and to worship God, and to promote, by all means, the religious well-being of his fellow-men. Statesmen have already sufficiently heavy taxes to pay for their power, without being compelled to strip themselves of their religion at the threshold of the cabinet or senate. No man in his senses would pronounce a legislator a heathen *ex officio*, and make a voluntary excommunication the condition of a seat in Parliament. Nor, further, need it be denied that the possession of legislative functions, and the rank and influence that is commonly connected with them, impose peculiar and responsible duties of their own ; and that the legislator or the minister is, in one sense at least, the servant to whom many talents are given. Such a man may well recollect that his elevated position gives tenfold conspicuousness, and tenfold potency for good or for evil, to his example ; while the perilous slipperiness of his position, the frauds and intrigues of parties, the corruption, vice, and venality, almost inseparable from courts, require all the defensive resources which religion itself can supply. All this, we say, we fully admit, but we contend that it does not follow that the legislator is bound in his *official capacity* to promote what he may consider the spiritual interests of men. In that capacity he has only to do with the law and its penal execution ; and religion has nothing about it correlative with such powers, or upon which they can possibly act. All that he can do to promote the cause of religion, he can do as a Christian, and not as a chancellor ; and all beyond that must be effected by those rude legal powers, the first application of which invades the territory of conscience and of Christ. To ascribe religious functions to a legislator *as such*, is as absurd as to ascribe them to a portrait painter, a drummer, or a knife-grinder as such.

Perhaps to the same primary fallacy may be traced that which

lies in the terms of the next sentence, that it is the duty of nations to own the authority of God; inasmuch as the one consideration of the purely and necessarily personal character of religion is equally inconsistent with both. The recognition of the Divine claims is an individual act; nor can there be any such thing as a national recognition of them, except, indeed, upon an hypothesis which certainly does not fall within the design of the writer, that every member of the community is a godly person. What has the nation, as to its majority, to do with the State patronage of a church or churches? Not one-eighth of its male, nor one-sixteenth of its adult, population has any part or influence in any legislative regulations, whether spiritual or secular; while the great bulk of the population, as we believe, are utterly uninformed as to the nature of the connexion which subsists between the Church and the State in this country. At all events, the patronage of any religious denomination by the State no more amounts to a national recognition of the Divine claims than the assumption of the title, Defender of the Faith, by Henry VIII., involved the same, or than the suppression of the words *Dei Gratia*, on a modern coin, indicates a national abjuration of religion, or even the infidelity of the Right Honourable Master of the Mint.

The next position of the writer, and the last on which we shall comment, is still more unsatisfactory. 'Let us no more hear,' says he, 'any such Pilate-like questions started as, What is truth? or, Who is to be the judge of it?' Why it is precisely the principle advocated by this writer, which renders such questions imperative and all-important; for, in undertaking the patronage, the establishment, the sustentation, or by what other name it may be called, of the Christian religion, the State must either embrace, in its management, all denominations alike, or must make choice of some one denomination as the nominal exponent of the national religion. Now we confidently presume that the writer does not desire that Catholics and all divisions of Protestants should, as far as their religion is concerned, be interfered with by the State, and all in the same way. And if, as the only alternative, some one division of the Christian world be selected for this purpose, the question, What, in the opinion of the Government, is truth? and the second question, How they became qualified to decide the first? are anything but Pilate-like, except on the candid supposition that Pontius Pilate was a very sensible, conscientious, and Christian man. For let us see the possibilities of the present case, not to put one that is imaginary. Let it be supposed that Lord John Russell is altogether at one with the Bishop of Exeter, and the Lord Chancellor with his learned brother, Sir Herbert Jenner Fust, and that these are fair speci-

mens of the cabinet and the episcopal bench. What would, in such a case, be the necessary consequence of this writer's dogma, that 'religion is a fair subject for legislation?' Why, that the whole ecclesiastical revenues of England and Ireland would be held by Anglo-Catholics;—in other words, by Papists, *minus* the dignity and the courage to own an unpopular name;—the retrogression of the clergy, to say nothing of the laity, to the days of the pious Plantagenets, the saintly Stuarts, and the lovely Laud! If a solicitous inquiry, touching such interests as these, is to be stigmatized as Pilate-like, we esteem it a great misfortune that Pilate is not now at Edinburgh, and the editor of the 'North British Review.' The writer appears to be fettered by the position accidentally occupied by the Free Church. The cloud which obscures his otherwise correct and candid views, perhaps rises, though unconsciously to himself, from the flesh-pots of Erastian Egypt—the house of Presbyterian bondage.

But we must return to review some of the more prominent positions taken by Mr. Tilson Marsh, a course which we should consider quite superfluous, had we not been informed that far more weight is attached by the evangelical clergy to his production, than to any other reply which Mr. Noel's Essay elicited. In a preliminary chapter, which attracted our special attention by the title of 'GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS,' we find the subject of Church-rates disposed of in the following paragraph:—

'The question of Church-rates, to which Mr. Noel alludes, is one here out of place. Suffice it to say that, if children have property of their own, left to them by will, it is by the civil law permissible to the parent to expend a portion of that money during their minority, and without their consent. Even so may the State act in reference to those who are committed to its care by God. It may take a portion of their property, and apply it to their religious education. Did the nation fully understand its own religious need, this tax would be unnecessary; but with respect to the knowledge of its religious deficiencies, even our nation is but a child.'—P. 16.

In this, as in some other cases which we are about to notice, we feel placed under a slight degree of embarrassment. To leave them without a word, to produce that sole effect upon the reader which their surprising feebleness of reasoning is calculated to produce, might seem disrespectful; to expose, by any lengthened arguments, their short-sightedness, would be a waste of time and space; we can only, therefore, direct attention to the errors they involve. And, in the case now before us, we would simply inquire whether the New Testament does really teach us that the religious interests of communities are committed by God to the care of the State, or to that of the disciples of Christ. Have the monarchs and legislators of empires (we will not mention names,

which will rise spontaneously to every reader's recollection)—have these been, or are they now, so distinguished by piety, zeal, and Christian wisdom, as to constitute them the natural and arbitrary guardians of the Church of Christ? And is the nation at large, and the believing portion of it in particular, in such a position with respect to the Parliament in this country and in France, and to monarchs in Russia and Austria, as may be rationally illustrated by the relation of the infant heirs of property to those wise and conscientious guardians who appropriate, without their consent, a portion of their income to the purpose of their education? If these questions are not met by the astounding absurdity of an affirmative, what are we to think of the writer who puts forth the argument we have just quoted?

Again, at page 385, we find the following concise argument for the 'connexion (this is the term for which Mr. Tilson Marsh specially pleads) between the Church and the State. The connexion system manifests to the world the power of religion to be such as of necessity to influence the State; while the voluntary system leaves the people to suppose that there is nothing in it which commends it to the common sense of the rulers of mankind.' Is, then, the phrase *common-sense* so entire a misnomer that it is to be restricted to the rulers of mankind? Has the world no standard whereby to measure the power of religion, save the influence it exerts upon rulers? Was that the correct standard in the apostolic age, and in all subsequent times, when the triumphs of Christianity have been the most signal? Has the faith of an empire no force till it is endorsed by an emperor? Is Church history nothing but the biography of monarchs? and is the religion of the Church altogether unimpressive on the world, until some of the rulers have believed? We can only remand Mr. Marsh back to one minute's reflection, and to the perusal of the most elementary historical work which his library may contain.

We have already alluded to the amusing brevity with which Mr. Marsh disposes of Mr. Noel's careful and admirable examination of the services of the Anglican Church. The discussion of the subject of baptism, in the 'Essay on Church and State,' is especially valuable for the candour of its spirit, and the patient study and completeness of theological knowledge which it displays. Mr. Marsh dismisses it in the following paragraph:—

'Mr. Noel objects also to the language of the Baptismal Service. Herein also he is in direct controversy with the Scotch Kirk, and with the Lutheran Church, as well as with our own. Amongst those names, also, which Mr. Noel will hold in reverence, of the members of the Church of England now gathered to their home of rest, I might enumerate Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, Bradford, Jewel, Hooker, Leighton,

Usher, and, in later times, Newton, Scott, Cecil, Cadogan, and Simeon, who all, surely not without consideration, yet without doubt or wavering, subscribed to the wording of that service. Have all these men of God gone to their rest in the maintenance of an unscriptural doctrine? God forbid.'—P. 409.

We reply; amongst those names which the Rev. Tilson Marsh will hold in reverence, now gathered to their home of rest, may be enumerated Bunyan, Dr. Watts, Dr. Doddridge, Dr. Carey, Robert Hall, John Foster, Andrew Fuller, Dr. Ryland, and Olinthus Gregory, who all, surely not without consideration, yet without doubt or wavering, *objected to that service altogether*. Have all these men of God gone to their rest in the maintenance of an unscriptural doctrine? God forbid! Mr. Marsh's university logic, scanty as it is, ought to have taught him the precise value of such an argument as this.

On the Ordination Service Mr. Marsh is equally brief. 'I must revert,' says he, 'to the principle that I have more than once before stated; we must receive as true what a man solemnly, and before God, professes to be true, unless we challenge to ourselves the superhuman power of reading the heart. If he says that he is moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon him the office for which he seeks, the bishop can only credit his word; with the candidate himself must lie the responsibility.' Now it seems obvious to suggest to Mr. Marsh that his position is defective on two cardinal grounds. The first is, that in weighing the pretensions of the candidate, some regard may well be paid to the secular advantages involved in his profession, especially where a part of the father's property is to be inherited solely upon the condition of that profession; and secondly, that the existing state of the Anglican Church, by the comparative paucity of its evangelical ministers, throws 'ominous conjecture' on the correctness of Mr. Marsh's views. It would be invidious to mention the bishop's chaplain, and, as times go, almost dangerous to mention the bishop; but it may perhaps be safe to inquire whether the present state of the Anglican Church justifies the method adopted, and whether the fact with relation to the clergy corroborates the candour of the bishops, and sanctions the present method of ordination. It is idle to say that the 'responsibility lies with the candidate himself'; the sole question is, whether the confidence exercised is justified by the result.

The same observations equally apply to Mr. Marsh's defence of the Catechism. 'Doubtless,' he says, 'the wording might be improved.' But this is merely to say that it is, as all would admit it to be, a human composition. . . . The member of the invisible Church is really "a child of God, a member of Christ, and an heir of the kingdom of heaven." A member of the visible Church

is also so by profession, and must be regarded by us as such, since we cannot search the heart.' This distinction between the visible and the invisible church, appears to us not only on general principles, but on this particular showing, to be the fundamental error. Every person who is 'christened,' is thus assured that he has the privileges and the prospects of a Christian. Can any man look abroad upon society and be insensible to the horrible mischief which results from this mistaken and ambitious catholicity? It is from this vicious principle, the sole intention of which in earlier times was to enlist the force of numbers in the interests of a State Church, that the easy ungodliness of society naturally flows. The vulgar rest on a sacramental security; and the Duke de Praslin, stained with a thousand crimes, thanks the priest who brought him salvation and prussic acid, for the great comfort he derived from both his services.

We forbear to refer to Mr. Marsh's most jejune defence of the Burial Service, and of the office of Confirmation, perhaps the most unscriptural of all.

On the whole, we feel bound to say of Mr. Marsh's performance—and we think that our quotations have justified the decision—that while in some respects it is the least censurable of those works which have been published in reply to Mr. Noel, it is one of the feeblest controversial works it has ever fallen to our lot to notice. Meanwhile, we confidently assert that the 'Essay on the Union of Church and State' remains unanswered. We have already endeavoured to account for the fact, that in spite of the secular and ministerial eminence of Mr. Noel's position, no man of great ecclesiastical distinction has come forward to reply to his book. His secession from that Establishment, which invited him by its honours and its emoluments, some of which he had already enjoyed, is of itself an impressive fact. His work is a standing testimony, alike against the theory and the practice of ecclesiastical establishments. No opponent has as yet met his arguments, or approached to the gentle greatness, or the cordial catholicity, with which he has urged them. He has illustrated the motto of his house, *Ou bien ou rien*. And though the days of martyrs and confessors have passed away for ever, the course he has adopted in relinquishing those prospects, to which his birth, his attainments, and his character, entitled him, brings his orbit far within the circumference of their undying glory.

ART. II.—*The Work of the Holy Spirit.* By William Hendry Stowell.
8vo. London: Jackson and Walford. 1849.

THIS is the Fourteenth Series of the Congregational Lecture. We rejoice that so valuable an institute has seen two weeks of years. It is not always that appointments of this kind, depending on popular opinion and taste, last so long; the permanence of the products of endowment is often disadvantageously contrasted with the ephemeral nature of those whose only support is in the judgment and approval of the people. In our view, the contrast is not wholly disadvantageous. Permanence is not necessarily a good thing. The permanence of evil is evil, and what is good may become evil by continuing beyond the time that supplied its need, and its appreciation. There is no virtue in clothing men's minds, any more than their bodies, in the dress of former generations—it disfigures; there is no virtue in training their religious faculties, any more than in teaching their intellect, after the obsolete system of former days—it cramps. To secure adaptation to a progressive race, the only way is to commit all that concerns it, with a generous trust, to its members as they appear; and this method, while it secures adaptation, secures it by a process full of blessing to those engaged in the working of it out. It is not what is obtained that is the chief advantage—the mode of obtaining it is beneficial also. The zeal of our forefathers, in making elaborate religious provision for their descendants, has often been attended with no other effect than that which disappoints the hopes of fond but foolish parents, in accumulating princely fortunes for their children. What was left is wasted, and those to whom it was left are injured.

The Congregational Lecture has had, on the whole, an honourable and a useful course. The themes discussed have been among the most important subjects of human inquiry and interest, and the mode of discussion has been, for the most part, highly creditable to the talents and attainments of the gentlemen engaged. If, now and then, a lecturer has attempted more than he has achieved, or promised more than he has performed; if his view of his subject has been partial or narrow; if he had brought to his task insufficient materials and powers; if he has advocated views, and employed reasonings, inconsistent with those of a predecessor; this is only to be naturally looked for in such a

course, and it has not occurred more often than is to be naturally looked for. The Independent body have reason to congratulate themselves on possessing so large a number of men capable of bringing to such themes of difficulty and delicacy the skill, the learning, and the power, which these lectures exhibit. They cannot fail to exert an important influence in guiding, forming, and establishing thought in the minds that have carefully studied their contents. Within their proper sphere, and for their proper object, they must be useful. We use this qualification, because theological lectures, like other things, have their limits of utility. They bear not all manner of fruit, but only fruit after their kind. It is no disparagement to the authors of the volumes now before us, to say that their design was not to inquire after truth, but to establish it; not to furnish their readers with the opinions and arguments of those from whom they differ, so much as to give the conclusions and reasons of their own minds; and that their utterances on leading points may be expected to agree with the general convictions of the denomination to which they belong. No denomination is likely, *as such*, to support or tolerate any wide departure, in its teaching, through such a medium as the Congregational Lecture, from its general faith; and no man, occupying the position of one of its lecturers (notwithstanding the usual and proper rule that he is to be held exclusively responsible for the reasonings and opinions advanced by him), is likely to obtrude his sentiments, supposing they should differ, on important matters, from the convictions of those with whom he is associated. The value of denominational lectures is, therefore, in their best estate, the value of an exposition and defence of leading denominational judgments, conducted in the light, and with the aids, of the most advanced knowledge, and the best trained intelligence. This, of course, is not the only thing required for the development of truth, but for other things we must look to individuals, and not to bodies of men. If truth is, subjectively, progressive; if all who profess to inquire, allow that their inquiries are not dishonest nor useless; there is scope for pursuits which Churches, *as such*, are not likely, nor fitted, to promote; and after all their best efforts to exhibit and commend their cherished principles (which are *their* proper contribution to the faith of mankind), there is room and need for every one, rightly gifted and disposed, to cultivate afresh the field of theological science.

We do not think that any of the Congregational lecturers have been entrusted with a more important subject than that which has fallen into the hands of Mr. Stowell. In every view of it, a position of pre-eminence must be assigned to it. The

prominence given to the work of the Spirit in the Bible realizes what might be expected on the supposition of the truth of the doctrine. If it be true, it is vital truth; if the knowledge of truth is ever essentially connected with spiritual religion, the knowledge of this truth is part of 'the wisdom of the just.' At the same time, there is no doctrine that demands, for its fair and due discussion, a greater combination of superior endowments. Found, as it is, in a revelation given in other languages, and requiring, for its expression, the use of terms among the most delicate forms of thought; related to the deepest and most spiritual principles of philosophy; and having been a principal element in some of the best and worst of the most remarkable manifestations of human nature; he who would sift and collect its evidence, expound its psychology, and trace and interpret its history, must be gifted, above many, with mental and moral qualifications. He must be a spiritual man, a man of calm, profound, discriminating thought, well acquainted with the text and spirit of holy writ, to whom the state and story of mankind are an open book, having intense sympathy with what is holy and divine, and yet able to command a cool and criticising judgment amidst the most exciting facts, and the most conflicting theories. The present volume bears evidence of Mr. Stowell's being such a man in no ordinary degree. Having supreme reverence for the teachings of Scripture, and opinions, on the great subject discussed, distinct and definite, he is yet evidently accustomed to take a comprehensive view of his theme, to consider it as but one of the ways of God, in harmony, as well as in connexion, with all other manifestations of his law and love. He can distinguish between things that differ, and perceive the agreement of those that are at one, though the first may take a similar form, and the last appear diversely. Generous in his mode of contemplating his kind, he brings no narrow nor partial canon to the judgment of their ways and words. Free in spirit, he does not mistake the reasoner for the judge; not cursed with 'a little knowledge,' he looks at human nature and Divine Providence with other eyes than those of a theologian. A practised author, commanding a free use of an extensive vocabulary, he makes an easy conveyance of his thoughts, thus saving his reader the trouble of being translator too.

Most seasons of unusual mental activity are marked by a peculiar type of thought and language. The present season has a type more marked than that of many. It is just as natural for a certain class of minds to receive its impressions as for the animal system to pass through certain states of disease. The great thing is 'to take it mildly.' Mr. Stowell is in this favourable condition.

Had he written in the last century, had he written but ten years ago, he would have written, in some respects, a very different book. He gives abundant evidence that he is acquainted with the investigations, not to say discoveries, of recent days; and that he is influenced by them also; but he retains his integrity, possesses his soul in patience, and is especially free from the delusion of supposing that what is obscure must be profound, that what is not clearly expressed must be incapable, from its depth and greatness, of clear expression.

The present conditions of the great truth which Mr. Stowell discusses, and of similar truths, are such as cannot be contemplated, by intelligent lovers of the gospel, without interest approaching to anxiety. Various causes have combined to render their treatment more difficult and delicate than it used to be. Questions are fairly up which respect, not so much the evidence afforded by revelation of particular doctrines, as the province and possibility of revelation itself. There are multitudes, and not of those least worthy of regard, whose case is not met by the citation, however correct, of passages of Scripture, however plain, nor even by the ordinary arguments in favour of the Christian religion. Treatises that would once have been received as satisfactory and conclusive, fail to remove, and even to touch, their difficulties. They are not feeble, perhaps, but they are irrelevant. The object aimed at has shifted its position, and, with unerring certainty, they miss it. For the complete establishment of the primary truths of Christianity, in the faith of this increasing class, it is necessary either that they be proved on grounds independently of the Christian records, or that the competency of the Christian records to prove them be made apparent. *In their present state of mind*, nothing is gained by showing that certain things are in the New Testament; their estimate of it is reduced by its support of them. This fact, painful or pleasant, is pressed upon us with a distinctness and force that cannot be mistaken nor despised. The great argument of Christian truths is, therefore, in its present condition, one of much profounder significance, and more comprehensive range, than many quiet and assured believers are apt to imagine. This has been often said, and without thanks. But the mutations, not to say progress, of human thought, wait not the conveniences of theological discussion.

Some of the same causes that have produced the state of things to which we have just adverted, have exposed the peculiar truths of Christianity to the danger of losing their peculiarity altogether. Starting with the principle that Christianity is the perfection of human reason, a principle, rightly explained and duly qualified,

both true and important, many are found adopting a method of dealing with the doctrines of revelation, which is as injurious as it is attractive. They admit the inspiration of the Scriptures, and are not prepared to rank that inspiration with poetical genius, yet so conceive of and present its most characteristic teachings as to deprive them of their specific features and worth. So bent are they on giving the reason and rationale of all that the Scriptures of truth contain, that they reduce them to the class and state of principles wrought everywhere into moral being and providential operation. Their error, while in one view it is that of believing too little, in another is that of believing too much. We are fairly terrified by the ease with which they make out that there is nothing special, after all, in the gospel. Instead of reverencing its mysteries, they perceive no mysteries to reverence. The strangest, strongest, of its sayings are very familiar matters. All that is meant by redemption, divine influence, and even the Trinity (for they stumble not at the word), they find in all things. If the Book of the Covenant were lost, and all traces of its teachings entirely effaced from human minds, they could, with the utmost facility, reproduce its spiritual laws and thoughts by the aid of their own consciousness, of providence, and of physical nature. The temple would be speedily 'restored' in its ancient glory. This evil has, no doubt, been fostered, in part, by a just and healthful repugnance to a most pernicious mode, once common, of treating Christian truth, which thought to honour it by isolation and alienation from every gift and work of God, as if he had bound himself to make no 'likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth.' As the fruit of His wisdom and love who 'formed the spirit of man within him,' it may be expected that Christianity will have many signs and shadows in our own nature, and the system in which we are placed; and a wise faith will rejoice to gaze upon its symbols, and employ its supports, wherever, and in whatever circumstances, they are found. But it is neither wisdom nor faith to denude its doctrines of their marked peculiarity by a rash and irreverent generalization. It claims to be considered as a special thing; it is intended to meet a special case. There is nothing like the necessity out of which it has arisen; there is nothing like the object it is designed to attain. It must be alone and singular to be at all; and every effort to commend it which denies or ignores this fact, is but a betrayal of it with a kiss, an embracing of it unto death.

It is impossible to doubt that the truths of Christianity are suffering much dishonour from a prevalent and growing disposi-

tion to deprecate doctrinal opinion. This, too, in part, is a reaction. The extravagant importance formerly attached to correctness of religious creed, the extent to which the articles of the faith which, whosoever would be saved must of necessity hold, have been multiplied, and the manner in which the spiritual conditions and spiritual influences of truth have been disesteemed, as compared with that in which mere accuracy of view has been honoured, strengthen and stimulate the tendency to treat doctrinal opinion as a matter of no account. Licentiousness succeeds to tyranny. Hence we find men, in all directions, rejoicing in the discovery that Christianity is not a creed, and that its spirit may exist and flourish with equal vigour in connexion with every variety of religious faith. This error, and it is not all error, can only be met by a very careful, discriminating mode of handling the gospel. Christianity is *not* a creed in the sense in which the word has been commonly employed. To prove this it is necessary only to peruse its records. But it is quite a different thing to say that it does not, and was not intended to, put us in possession of views of the Divine nature and administration, and of human character and destiny, without which there can be no spiritual renovation and sanctification of fallen beings. That godliness may thrive apart from a minute and particular orthodoxy, that it may thrive amidst much doctrinal error, that the efficacy of faith is not only according to the number of the things believed, but also according to the intensity with which they are believed, all this is readily and cheerfully conceded and maintained; but to dissolve the partnership between religion and truth can only bring about a disastrous bankruptcy.

The remarks now made may serve to indicate our sense of the importance, at the present time, of the serious and skilful discussion of Mr. Stowell's theme. He has not written with a direct view to the difficulties and dangers now referred to, but he has written with a constant consciousness of their presence and magnitude. It did not fall within his plan to give them distinct and formal consideration, but his volume bears abundant evidence that he understands them, and contains much that will be useful to such readers as are exposed to them. We wish that it contained more. Indeed, it is to us a matter of surprise and regret that there has not been in the Congregational Lectures, generally, a more direct and complete adaptation to the wants and claims of such readers. The relations of revelation to theology, and of theology to religion, demand discussion. They must be discussed. If orthodox writers ignore them, others do not. And where could they be more appropriately discussed

than in lectures established 'to illustrate the evidence and importance of the great doctrines of revelation ; to exhibit the true principles of philology in their application to such doctrines ; to prove the accordance and identity of genuine philosophy with the records and discoveries of Scripture ; and to trace the errors and corruptions which have existed in the Christian Church to their proper sources ; and by the connexion of sound reasoning with the honest interpretation of God's holy word, to point out the methods of refutation and counteraction.'* Happy he to whom this mighty argument shall be assigned, and who shall conduct it in a temper, and with materials, worthy of its greatness !

Mr. Stowell may justly plead that he could not do every thing. We admit the plea. We are disposed to complain, not that he has done so little, but that he has attempted so much. If this complaint be reasonable, he has only erred in company with others. Several of his predecessors have taken too wide a range of view. By this means they have made their productions more attractive at the expense of their real and permanent usefulness. A more severe and profound investigation of particular portions of their subjects would have been gladly purchased by many at the cost of the entire omission of other portions. In the present case we have especial reason of regret. Mr. Stowell shall speak for himself :—

' The plan on which these Congregational Lectures are drawn up has been gradually formed during a pastoral ministry of thirty years, and amid the engagements which have employed me through a large portion of the latter half of that period as a teacher of theology. Nothing has seemed to me to be more natural than to begin our inquiries on this subject by examining the report of human consciousness, then proceeding to the investigation of the Scriptures, and afterwards to the history of human opinions. I should have been glad if the nature of these prelections, and the limits prescribed for them, had allowed of a distinct and critical handling of all the portions of Scripture which relate to the Holy Spirit. As it is, I have contented myself with classifying those portions of Scripture, and giving the results of an inquiry which has been neither brief nor superficial.'

We, too, should have been glad of 'a distinct and critical handling of all the portions of Scripture which relate to the Holy Spirit.' A mere classification of those portions, however complete, with the results of an inquiry never so satisfactory to the author's mind, cannot be reasonably supposed to meet the requirement of this part of the discussion. We should have been gratified and instructed by a careful examination of particular

* Advertisement by the Committee of the Congregational Library.

passages, and of the reasons of their application to the points for whose establishment and illustration they are adduced, even had such an examination necessitated a selection of the principal passages. Arguments are not to be counted, but weighed. Instead, for instance, of the simple quotation of the promises of our Lord, recorded in the Gospel of John, we should much like to know why these promises so plainly appear (as they must do to Mr. Stowell's mind) to concern 'the work of the Holy Spirit of God *in actually saving man*.' For our part, we are not at all convinced (for example) that the passage in John xvi. 8—11, has the sense in which it is often cited, and cited by our author.* To whom was the promise made? To whom was the Comforter to 'come?' 'If I depart, I will send him unto you. And *when he is come*, he will reprove (convince) the world, &c.' It was not by his coming to *the world*, as is commonly supposed, but by his coming to *the apostles*, that the world was to be convinced; that is, the extraordinary endowments which they should possess in consequence of the pouring out of the Spirit would evince the truth of Christ's claims, and the guilt of the Jews in rejecting them. There are other passages respecting which, as they are employed by Mr. Stowell, we desire more information; while the value of his work would have been enhanced to many readers, and not least to those most in need of clear and convincing proofs, if more of the process of his inquiries had been given as well as their 'results.'

The volume consists of seven lectures, bearing the following titles:—I. *Capacities, Condition, and Wants of Man, as a Spiritual Being*.—II. *The General Doctrine of the Scriptures relating to the Holy Spirit*.—III. *The Work of the Holy Spirit in the Salvation of Men*.—IV. *Church Notions respecting the Work of the Spirit*.—V. *Mysticism*.—VI. *The Consciousness of Spiritual Life in Harmony with Divine Revelation*.—VII. *The Moral Energy of the Spiritual Life*.

In his first lecture, Mr. Stowell makes his appeal 'not to books, but to thoughts; not to opinions that may be derived from others, but to the calm, independent judgment of each man's separate self.' After some remarks on 'the *faculty* of language, as a testimony to the working and the power of the human spirit, and on the words that serve as the most common signs of these ideas, he replies to the inquiry, 'What are those spiritual capaci-

* It has struck us as very strange that so masterly a writer as Archdeacon Hare should find a course of lectures on this passage without attempting to show that it refers to that work of the Spirit of which he treats. 'The Mission of the Comforter,' as explained by his text, is very different from that which he so beautifully illustrates.

ties and powers which man, as man, possesses?' by stating and illustrating the following points—that the great fundamental fact in relation to the human mind, soul, or spirit, is consciousness; that our consciousness respects intelligence,—the admiration and enjoyment of the beautiful,—the apprehension, approval, and choice of the right, the moral constitution being certified by the separate facts, of which we are conscious at different times, of free and voluntary action, of particular desire or affections prompting us to act, of regard to some actions as wise and good, because they are right, and of self-judgment,—the last general item being good or evil, well-being or ill-being, and the constitution and tendency of our nature to seek the one and to avoid the other. These facts are brought out vigorously and boldly, as becomes them. There is no ambiguity nor timidity in their assertion. Constituting the essential elements of all religion, they are presented with a just confidence in their certainty, and their vital relation to all that is most precious and powerful to man. The trumpet gives no doubtful sound. The ground is trodden as if it were firm. The hand trembles not as it lays the foundation of religious faith deep in the 'secret places' of the human spirit.

'Such is our spiritual nature. These are the "things of a man," which are known by the "spirit of man which is in him." These are his capacities. They belong to every man. Were the law of this nature obeyed freely, heartily, constantly, and universally, where would be the darkness of ignorance? Where would be the perversion of taste? Where would be the bondage of sin? Where would be the wail of misery? In such a nature we see the likeness of God. Who could be its author, but he who knows all things, who is the original of all beauty, whose goodness is perfect, and whose blessedness is for evermore? Why should *he* create such a being as man knows himself to be, but that he might be a partaker of the Divine felicity, to irradiate the universe with his Creator's glory?'—Pp. 22, 23.

To a second inquiry, 'In what state do we now find the spirit of man, in his relation to God?' the reply is also made by the aid of consciousness, which leads us 'to form a similar judgment of other men, when their outward life resembles the outward life resulting from that of which we are conscious in ourselves,' and to which 'the inspired writers make their appeal, when they challenge each man, and denounce all men, as guilty of sin in the presence of the heart-searching God.' The report given of man's spiritual condition by human consciousness, and by human history interpreted by human consciousness, represents him as choosing the material in religion rather than the spiritual, the false rather than the true, the speculative rather

than the practical, the sentimental rather than the moral, the human rather than the divine.

A third inquiry is proposed, ‘What are the wants of the human spirit, arising from its being in this state?’ Man being fitted, by his constitution, to what is true, and right, and good, while, in point of fact, he chooses what is false, and wrong, and evil, it appears ‘that, whatever may be the cause of this wrong choice, that cause must be removed, and an opposite cause or principle must be brought into action. Now, we can conceive of the cause of this wrong choice in no other way than,—either as an unavoidable weakness in the moral perceptions of the human spirit; an irresistible motive from without; or an inward and spontaneous predisposition, which, when unfettered and unchecked, issues in a wrong choice.’ Each of these suppositions is separately examined. The first two being shown to be untenable, the author thus deals with the last:—

‘We can conceive of an inward and spontaneous predisposition which, unfettered and unchecked, issues in a wrong choice. We may attempt to analyze this predisposition; but the finest analysis results in the ultimate fact of a man’s consciousness that he has an inclination, a liking, a spirit which is his own, which he cherishes, which he seeks to gratify, and which is the reason why *he* takes that view of external objects, or of his own act in relation to such objects, which becomes the motive of his choice. To deny that there is such an ultimate fact as this, is to deny that of which our consciousness makes us sure; and to overlook this fact, is to substitute for the actual free choice of the human spirit a *merely metaphysical abstraction*, which has no relation to human nature, as human nature is. It is on this actuality of man’s spiritual nature, and on this alone, that we can found the notions of personal responsibility, of moral obligation, and of religious duty, so that besides the indestructible evidence of consciousness, as to the fact itself, we have the additional evidence afforded by the sense of responsibility, of moral obligation, and of religious duty, that we are right in affirming that the cause, the sole cause, in every instance, of a wrong choice, in a moral action, is—*a man’s own spirit*. Our way to the simple truth, therefore, lies plain before us. That which man ought to be, but is not, is this—inwardly and spontaneously propense to the right, the morally good, the truly religious, in harmony with the nature and with the will of God. The opposite propension must be removed; and this right principle must come into action, or he still remains an alien from God, and, being such, incapable of pleasing God, and unfit to enjoy his presence. Man needs much instruction for his mental development, careful training, infinite corrections in his actual views of things to be done; but all this falls short of being ‘renewed in the spirit of his mind.’ He needs, undoubtedly he needs, some ground of acceptance with God which is not in himself; and, according to the gospel, that ground is laid by the grace of God in the propitiation of Jesus Christ, which is revealed to him, that, by believing, he may be saved; but it is not in *the spirit* of man to believe in this propitiation,

so as to accept the free gift of Divine love, until he becomes one of the sons of God, who are born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.'—Pp. 47, 48.

By these facts and reasonings, preparation is made for 'the lessons which God himself has given—as to the way in which this, the greatest want of man, is to be supplied.' The need is that of a change of spirit. There is nothing in man to effect his own change, and we are not conscious of any power to change the disposition of our brother man. The author merely states these facts. They deserve a longer notice, both from their own nature, and their position as connecting links between his previous reasonings, and the conclusions which he draws, of the necessity of divine agency to effect the required change.

'Whether God *can* do it or not, may be either a very simple or a most complicated question. Take it in its simplicity, and it admits of only one reply : '*with God all things are possible.*' Take the question as it really stands, that is, as it is complicated with other questions, and you find yourself surrounded with some of the stoutest difficulties that have ever tested the thinking powers of man; for you have to draw the line between the psychical and the moral, between the voluntary and the not voluntary, between the human and the divine, in spiritual agency; you are to show what we are to conceive of God as doing without deviating from that in his nature which is the foundation of all moral government; you are to exhibit the discordance, or the harmony, which there may be, between the passive and the active, in a being who is the subject of a moral government; you are to sound the depths of man; and you are to feel how unfathomable are the depths of God. Should there be any person to whom these questions are new, or by whom they have not been pondered, with the calm, earnest, and prolonged attention which they require and deserve, he may hastily decide them one way or the other, according to his modes of thinking; or, overlooking them, he may take *that which is not evidence as a reason for believing*; or, presuming that his mode of interpreting Scripture is entitled to the authority which belongs only to an inspired teacher, he may fearlessly, and without hesitation, affirm that it is, or it is not, congruous with man's nature, and with God's nature, that God should do this work.'—Pp. 49, 50.

The conditions of a just conclusion respecting the work of God in changing the spirit of man are stated to be these—such work must do no violence to the conscious freedom and activity of man's nature; it must do no violence to the principle of Divine government; it must not necessarily arise out of the relations which God's moral government of man has established; it must be mysterious, but not more mysterious, nor otherwise mysterious, than some other works which we ascribe to God; and it must be clearly taught in the inspired Scriptures.

The second lecture is occupied with the general doctrine of Scripture respecting the Spirit of God. The Scriptures teach that there is a work of God in man, which secures his salvation, and ascribes this work specifically to the Holy Spirit. Preliminary inquiries are dealt with. *What* are we to understand by 'the Spirit,' 'the Holy Ghost,' 'the Spirit of God?' What are those works of the Holy Spirit which do not renew, purify, and save man? Allowing 'the Spirit of God' to express, in a peculiar mode, the general fact of divine agency, 'God in action,' as 'the spirit of man' means 'man in action,' it is maintained that this explanation does not apply to 'numerous passages of the Scriptures in which the agency of the Holy Spirit is recorded, or referred to, as that of a conscious, intelligent, and energetic agent, distinct in personality from "the Father," and from "the Son," and subordinate in his mission, and in his acts, to the Father, and to the Son.' Leaving the mystery of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, against human explanations of which there is a bold and an honest caution as 'founded on an erroneous principle,' being '*analyses of human thoughts or words*, not developments of divine realities,' Mr. Stowell passes to the consideration of the work of the Spirit in creation, the work of the Spirit wrought in 'the only Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus,' and that work of the Spirit in men which has no direct and immediate connexion with spiritual salvation. The Spirit is thus viewed as the giver of 'extraordinary power for the accomplishment of extraordinary undertakings;' as the author of 'divine knowledge, and special modes of attesting divine truth;' and as the producer of those effects which accompany divine truth 'as the means of moral suasion.' The truths of the gospel have an influence upon men short of regeneration; but inasmuch as they were originally taught by the Holy Spirit, it is proper to speak of that influence as the influence of the Holy Spirit. On this principle there is 'no difficulty in perceiving the force and the application of several passages of Scripture which appear to have been grossly misunderstood, and somewhat warped for the purposes of sectarian controversy'—passages which describe the Spirit of God as being 'resisted.' This lecture contains much important matter which, however familiar to those who have brought deep and generous thought to the study of revealed truth, has not received its proper share of attention in popular religious literature, and the teachings of the general ministry.

The author enters, in the third lecture, upon the consideration of the work of the Holy Spirit of God in actually saving man. His first business is to collect and classify the principal testimonies of Scripture respecting this work. These are arranged

in the following order : prayers, and other expressions of devotional sentiment ; promises ; doctrinal statements and practical exhortations, and allusions ; facts in the planting of the first churches by the apostles. The truths which are directly taught, or obviously implied, in the passages thus collected, are then illustrated. These truths comprise 'the abiding presence of the Spirit of God in the spirit of man ;' the production by the Spirit of God in the spirit of man of 'those happy effects which, taken together, may be expressed by the one word—salvation ;' the constitution by those effects, thus produced, of 'the personal difference between him who is saved, and them who are condemned ;' and the possession by those in whom they are found, of 'the pledge of endless happiness and glory.' These truths are exhibited in their harmony 'with other truths made known by human consciousness, or by divine revelation,' and thus the revealed doctrine of sanctifying grace is shown to realize the conditions specified in the first lecture. In the last place, some facts are offered in illustration of these truths, 'from the history of man in general, and of the church in particular.' Extracts from Greek and Roman writers evince the belief in ancient times of the direct influence of the Deity on man. Socrates, Xenophon, Plato, Cicero, Seneca, Marcus Antoninus, are adduced, not to show that they were acquainted with the Scripture doctrine of the Spirit's work, nor as if their opinions possessed authority, but as betraying 'a sense, more or less profound and accurate, of their fearful want of something different from their reasoning faculties, and beyond their moral powers, to raise them to the perfection of human nature.' 'The course of Christian literature' is likewise appealed to, as testifying to the fact 'that the doctrine which we believe to be taught in the Scriptures is incorporated with nearly all that is distinctive, with whatever has been sublime, holy, mighty, and consoling, in the living history of Christianity.' Even the pretensions of impostors to a peculiar possession of divine influence, and their acceptance, are not without value in this view ; while the firm and cordial faith of the Holy Ghost has ever gone hand in hand with the doctrinal integrity and spiritual power of Christianity. The discussions of this lecture, which, in many respects, is the most important of the series, have frequently tempted us to remark, if not to disquisition. The necessities of space, however, compel us to refrain. In addition to a general observation, already made, we shall merely say that the author's mind is apt to logical processes. He is fond of reasoning. With difficulties and perplexities he deals as 'very little things.' He sees in the distance the occasion of strife. 'He smelleth the battle afar off.' The real worth of his *prælections* is not in any new light he sheds on either

the nature or the evidence of the truth which he seeks to establish and expound, but in the fair and broad mode in which he presents the peculiar principles of the gospel, and deals with misconceptions of them on the one hand, and objections to them on the other. At the same time, it must not be supposed that the form and method of his work are polemical. Of controversy with particular writers he keeps quite clear, dealing with opposing views on their own merits, and, as far as possible, satisfying the necessities of debate by a full and manifold exhibition of the truth. Indeed, so intent is he upon this, that he occasionally goes over ground already trodden, and injures his work, as a whole, by the manner in which he aims to perfect particular parts.

The fourth lecture is very much more to our mind and taste than any, as it deals with 'Church notions relating to the Holy Ghost,' in a way of great boldness and intelligence. It shows more insight and power of penetrating beneath the forms of expression and opinion, and withal applies principles of acknowledged truth with more justice and fidelity, than are often found. Many, on reading it, will be surprised to discover notions that they have been accustomed to regard as very innocent and holy, solemnly arraigned and condemned as, in spirit, 'Church notions,' containing the seminal principle of what they most indignantly reject, and against which they most loudly protest. The discussion thus begins:—

'Not the least humiliating of the reflections forced upon the most anxious observers is, that nearly all men agree in looking *without*, for the impediments to the spiritual life. All the impediments, however, *are within*. They are in the Church as a visible, catholic body. They are in particular churches—in every church. They are *in man*—wrought in the framework of his ideas of what the Church is, of what the Church does, and of the way in which the Church works. All this comes from confounding the teaching of the Scriptures respecting facts, with the human modes of conceiving of those facts which are embodied in Church systems. We shall be well employed in the present lecture, if we can present this confusion in a form in which it can be handled. This we cannot do unless we proceed in the spirit of disciples—the disciples, not of the Church, but of the Spirit. We have seen in the New Testament, what the Holy Spirit teaches respecting man. *We are now to see, in Church documents, of sundry kinds, what man has been teaching respecting the Spirit.*'—Pp. 205, 206.

The general ecclesiastical theory is thus given—that what the Spirit of God does in this matter, is done *by*, or *through*, the ordinances of the Church *administered* in that way which the Church has determined to be properly authorized. This general notion appears in different forms, as in the ascription to the

visible Church of a federal relation to God, which involves the possession of exclusive spiritual blessings; the attribution of peculiar spiritualness to certain persons, and certain usages; the assumption of a certain right in the rulers of the Church to dictate, to control, or to supersede the spiritual actions of its members; the relation supposed to exist between the spiritual Church and the civil polity of men, including spiritual supremacy, the national incorporation, or legal establishment, of churches, and whatsoever goes to secularize the institutions of the gospel. All these notions are pervaded by one fundamental error; 'not one of them is based on man's spiritual nature, nor on those portions of Scripture which expressly and fully set forth the truth respecting the Holy Spirit.' They are founded on usage, and supported by tradition, the appeal to which in the present day is a much more comprehensive evil than is, perhaps, fully appreciated even by those who object most strongly to the practice; their social effect is now what it ever was; they have occasioned many controversies among Christians which have been dishonourable and hurtful to each of the contending parties; they have retarded the spread of the gospel. The illustration of these points deserves the grave consideration of all who are anxious to understand the true relation of the Church to spiritual religion.

'Mysticism' forms the subject of the fifth lecture, and under the heads of 'Speculative,' 'Contemplative,' 'Imaginative,' and 'Practical' (not the most philosophical division that could be made), the author brings much thought and reading to the interpretation of some of the most interesting and curious, and, as we think, important phenomena of spiritual history. 'The common error,' pervading all forms of mysticism, is said to be the taking of 'the workings of the *mind of man*, his thoughts, his feelings, and his fancies, for revelations from God.'

In evincing 'the harmony of the consciousness of spiritual life with divine revelation,' report is first made of the testimony of consciousness. The believer is conscious of regarding what the gospel makes known, as said to him by the Holy Spirit; of certain emotions as the effect of his belief; of acting in a way different from the way of unbelievers from reasons furnished by the gospel; of deriving from the same source 'encouragements to persevere in his peculiar course; of finding in it checks needful for his moral discipline; inducements to pray; peace, security, hope; scope for his purest social yearnings in the Church. The testimony of Scripture is next presented, embracing the inwardness, spirituality, and activity of the Christian life; its cause, in some distinct act of God; its connexion with grace; its production by the Spirit; its peculiar relation to

Christ'; its dependence upon the belief of the truth.' In the last place, the principal explanations which theologians have given of the spiritual life, pass under review; viz., the traditional, the enthusiastical, the philosophical.

'The Moral Energy of the Spiritual Life,' receives an eloquent illustration in the last lecture. The positions discussed (some of them discussed before), are,—that the work of the Spirit is not necessary to the responsibility of man; that the spiritual life produces whatever can be included in the highest and most refined morality; that its results transcend the aims of ethical philosophy, or of conventional morality; and, as the conclusion of the entire argument, that its practical energy displays the distinct, yet harmonious workings of the spirit of man, and of the Spirit of God. The author thus concludes his lectures:—

'I have no doubt that when men turn to God there is a direct work of the Holy Spirit in their hearts; that there is, also, a *consequent* operation of the truth believed by the converted to induce them to turn to God, and to excite and encourage them to the attainment of perfect holiness; that it is the Holy Spirit's power within them that renders them willing to attend to that which the same Spirit teaches them in his word; that in attending to that teaching, and in following it, they act with the entire freedom of their intellectual and moral constitution; that the operations of material nature are not analogous to the agency of spiritual being; and that philosophy has not yet explained either the one or the other; that I am not warranted to say, the truth is the means of beginning the spiritual life, though I am unable to conceive of that life in man being *developed* otherwise than by his free, practical, and devout belief of the truth which the Holy Spirit has revealed.

'Short of this I cannot stop. Beyond this I do not go. I honour the gifts, and appreciate the motives, of the men—whether dead or living—from whom my deliberate judgment leads me to dissent. But to me the work of the Holy Spirit is, at this hour, what it has ever been—a mystery. I receive the declarations of Scripture on this subject with reverent faith; I have laboured to expound them, here and elsewhere, according to the measure of ability for which I feel that I must render an account unto God, and with whatever light of knowledge he has enabled me to acquire. In them I read, what is to me, a plain revelation of the fact that the Spirit of God works immediately in the spirit of man for the salvation of his soul, and for the redemption of his body; and, also, the fact—to which consciousness bears witness—that he in whose spirit the Divine work begins, gives proof that it has so begun in him, by believing the gospel, and by leading a life of watchfulness and prayer, of humble trust in Christ, of reliance on the promises of grace, and of patient preparation for that world where his holiness will be complete, and where his blessedness will last for ever.'

—Pp. 396, 397.

The whole work is written in the spirit indicated in this pas-

sage, the only spirit of wise inquiry and dignified discussion. This extract will suggest to the intelligent reader the existence, in the author's mind, of certain conditions, apart from which but little satisfaction could result from his labours. He keeps in view *the exact design and matter* of the Scripture revelation on this subject. That revelation concerns *the facts* of the Spirit's work. It was not intended to explain the mode of the saving operation. And thus it deals with divine influence as it deals with all other truths. The Bible is not a book of science or philosophy. This is now generally conceded. But the concession is not always sufficiently complete, nor consistently applied. Exceptions are practically made, which violate the great principle, a principle whose full and honest maintenance is necessary to the interpretation of the word of God, and to the vindication of its claims. We are not to look to it for our psychology any more than for our geology or astronomy. That certain things *are*, it tells us to the joy and salvation of our souls; but the manner in which they are, and their relation to other things, may receive various explanations from those who equally embrace the truth revealed, and equally honour its revelation. The cunningly-devised and nicely-arranged systems of theology embody the results of the application of human faculties and human views to the simple statements of Scripture. The same elements of truth are put into different forms and combinations by different minds. So is it with the truth respecting the work of the Spirit. That the Spirit works in certain minds, in connexion with certain means, and for certain ends, is the substance of Scripture statements; but those statements are not made in language of metaphysical form and nicety, nor with a view of answering the inquiries, and solving the problems, of metaphysical science. We have a right to ask, and, asking properly, may hope to find, the meaning of Scripture declarations of the great facts of spiritual power and grace; but we must carefully distinguish between these declarations, and the doctrines of philosophy, or the conclusions drawn from individual experience.

It will also be seen that our author has just conceptions of *the peculiar nature of the work* which the Holy Spirit effects in the hearts of the saved. That it is spiritual, 'that the operations of material nature are not analogous to the agency of spiritual being,' are facts ever remembered by himself, and ever kept in the memory of his readers. As to the action of spirit on spirit, he guards against the errors of supposing that its nature can be represented by physical illustrations, and that its presence, in itself, can be the subject of distinct and immediate consciousness. Few need to be informed to what an extent these errors have prevailed in popular, and even professional theology, and with

what injurious results. The 'work' of the Spirit has been described in the grossest style of material and mechanical operation, in forgetfulness of the essential nature of its agent and its subject, to the disgust of the intelligent, the distress of the ignorant, and the serious injury of the wicked and profane. The unskilful use of figurative language on this subject has been fraught with mischief. If metaphysical science owes a grudge to such language for having led astray, and perplexed, the thought of some of its wisest students, much graver is the condemnation which it deserves from theological science for having formed and fostered the most serious errors respecting 'the things of the Spirit of God.' The metaphors of Scripture are beautiful and instructive, used, as they are, by the sacred writers, to set forth particular features of divine grace, such as its greatness and glory; but to employ such metaphors as if they possessed any force or fitness to convey accurate conceptions of the essence and mode of its action is to pervert nature to the dishonour of the gospel.

It is 'a mystery.' We may know its general laws, perceive its signs, and rejoice in 'its fruits'; but itself is one of the secrets of the Lord. 'Great things doeth he which we cannot comprehend.' But the mystery, in its essence, is not peculiar to Christianity. There is spirit independently of the gospel; and it is our ignorance of what spirit is that surrounds the operations of the Holy Ghost with so impenetrable a cloud. When we understand the nature of our own higher being, and of the gracious agent with whom we have to do, we may detect their points of contact, may perceive the manner of their fellowship, but not till then; and are not these subjects worthy of our profoundest study? Is not spirit the proper, final home of thought? What is matter, in its richest arrangements, but its comely dress; in its most melodious utterances, but the sweet music of its voice? Nor let it be imagined, that if a secret now, it will be one for ever. The tendency of both science and philosophy is strong towards its manifestation. Strange things are taking place, which, to whatever they may lead, will probably lead to a further revelation of the *great reality*. And if it be forbidden for us to know it now, shall it not be known hereafter? And having worshipped here, in the holy place of facts, and forms, and signs, may we not hereafter be privileged to enter into the holiest of all—the hidden truth of God's most secret converse with the souls of the sanctified?

ART. III.—*A Catholic History of England.* By W. B. M'Cabe.
Vol. II. London: T. C. Newby. 1849.

MR. M'CABE has published the second volume of his great work—‘The History of England as written in the very words of the Monkish Historians.’—Whatever may be our opinion of the truthfulness of these historians, such a work must be both interesting and valuable. It presents a picture of society in England during the dark ages, drawn by contemporaries, who belonged to a class which nearly monopolized the learning of the times. If the light which was in them be darkness, how great must have been the darkness of those who had no better, in many cases, no other instructors! And if these be the productions of the most enlightened men of the times, how sad must have been the condition of the mass of the population! Mr. M'Cabe does not think it was worse than it is now. He is enamoured of the monastic system; and we willingly admit that he displays great learning and ability in defending it. He is a firm believer in its virtues, and implicitly receives the histories of the monks as true,—miracles and all. So strong is his faith, that he does not shrink from the publication of any absurdity, and unhesitatingly classes among ‘infidels’ those writers who are disposed to question his authorities. ‘Anti-Catholic historians,’ as he calls them, have certainly wronged the monks in some particulars, as their zealous vindicator has shown. We are glad to see their case in the hands of so learned and conscientious an author.

As Protestants, we want only to know the truth. We are willing to give credit to the monks wherever they deserve it. We would deduct naught from what society owes them. We only wish that both sides of the picture should be seen and appreciated.

We are, therefore, sorry for the announcement that another volume must terminate the work, which will close with the accession of William the Conqueror. The monkish chronicles from that period to the Reformation would be still more interesting than those of the Saxon period, as describing a state of society in which many of our modern institutions and customs germinated, and in which the Saxon, Danish, and British people struggled against the terrible effects of the *Conquest*, and rose gradually and painfully to their present power in the State. But Mr. M'Cabe is unable to finish the immense task he undertook. The wonder is, that he undertook so laborious a task at all, and that he has been enabled to accomplish it so far. It exhibits a vast

deal of reading and the application of much learning and criticism, as well as a sound judgment in the selection and arrangement of materials. Yet this is not the work of a man of leisure and of independent means ;—not the work of a priest or monk who has nothing to do but study ;—but of a layman, who has a family to support by his own exertions, and whose time belongs to others. Hence he tells us that it has habitually happened for years, that his work, ‘ commencing at ten o’clock in the day, has been prolonged without an hour’s intermission until one and two o’clock the following morning.’—To proceed with the work on the plan with which he commenced, ‘ and to bring to a conclusion the *first part*, would require from one situated as he is fifteen more years of a life of such ceaseless labour as he has described.’ Conscious that his health could not continue with such toil, he has properly paused in his labours. But why should not such a man be placed in a condition which would enable him to devote all his time to what Roman Catholics must regard as a most important work of faith and labour of love ? Is there no college in which they could make him a professor of history ? Sure we are that no ecclesiastic would exceed him in zeal for the Catholic cause ; and we question if they have a man among them so well qualified to do that cause historical justice, so far as the United Kingdom is concerned.

This volume begins with the reign of Ethelwulf, king of the West Saxons, and ends with that of Edgar. It is the period during which the ravages of the Danes were most destructive. They assailed the country on all sides, their attacks were unceasing ; for they came not to possess the land, but to plunder, and to destroy what they could not carry away.

It seemed almost miraculous how and whence these different bands arrived. The following passage gives a vivid idea of their numbers and their devastations :—

‘ Sometimes, when the kings of the English were marching at the head of their soldiers, for the purpose of repulsing the enemy from the eastern coast, and long before they could approach the aggressors, a messenger might be seen hurrying towards them—“ Whither is it that your Majesty is directing your military strength ? An immense fleet of the Pagans has disembarked its forces on the southern coast of England, and already the invaders are laying waste the towns and villages, and all are perishing by fire or the sword ! ” The same day, perhaps, another messenger would be found, exclaiming, “ To what place is your Majesty flying ? A terrible army has landed on the western coast of England, which if you do not hasten to meet, it will be supposed you are afraid to encounter, and are retreating before it, while it hotly pursues you with conflagration and carnage.” ’

Upon the same day, or not improbably the following, a third

messenger might be heard thus appealing to the great men of the kingdom:—‘ Whither, noble Ealdermen, are you hastening? The Danes have reached the northern shores—already are your mansions burned to the ground, your treasures carried off, your sons tossed from spear top to spear top by the Danes, your wives rendered the victims of their vile passions, or carried off by them to be their slaves.’

Sometimes they took possession of a town and made it their winter quarters, the Saxons not having the means of dislodging them. If they won a battle, the country was at their mercy, because with the flight, the English had exhausted their stock of weapons, whereas the Danes had an ample supply in their ships, to which they were accustomed to retreat, and then return to the work of plunder and slaughter, reinforced and equipped afresh. Although they generally came merely as pirates, to return with their booty, and be followed by others resolved to make their fortune in the same way, yet they sometimes settled in the districts from which they had cleared the inhabitants. Some of the English monarchs, particularly Alfred, Edmund, and Edgar, completely expelled or subjugated these hardy invaders. It was in the year 942, that Edmund wrested from their hands the five Danish burghs, Leicester, Lincoln, Nottingham, Stamford, and Derby, and reduced the entire of Mercia to his dominions. But down to the Norman conquest, the Danes remained in great numbers, and mixed with the natives in almost every village. They abounded most north of the Humber, and when there was a strong and just government, as in the time of Edgar the Confessor, the Danes were counted among the best and most loyal of the king’s subjects. It was where they were most numerous, that Normans found the work of conquest most difficult, tedious, and perilous; and when all hopes of delivering the nation were abandoned, these brave men maintained their wild liberty in the forests and the mountains.

However, the incessant incursions of such powerful hordes as the Danes, pursued from generation to generation, must have had a disastrous effect on the English people. Their wealth was exhausted, their industry impeded, their institutions, civil and religious, rendered inoperative, and their morals corrupted. The state of religion and learning was naturally much affected by such causes; and when we find it very low indeed, we must in fairness take this consideration into account.

The main object of the monkish historians was not to give a detail of political events; nor do we learn much from their pages about the condition of the people. They treated civil matters merely as the basis of monastic operations. They tell us briefly, but magniloquently, of invasions and wars. They give us pretty

full accounts of royal families, with their virtues and vices. But these are all estimated from one point of view. The monarch who favoured the monks—who repaired, built, and endowed monasteries—and who had a peculiar veneration for relics, was the most glorious of princes, and a pattern of all excellence. But if he chanced to be hostile to the regular orders, he was reviled as a monster of wickedness, and his death was almost invariably ascribed to a Divine judgment. Of the farmers, the artificers, the traders, and the people in general, with their social condition and habits, the monkish writers tell us little; still less of the secular or parochial clergy. The monasteries absorbed their attention, and for them every event was interesting, and every person worthy, as the one or other subserved the glory and aggrandisement of the order.

The miracles in this volume are not so numerous as in the first, but they are equally uncalled for, incredible, and absurd. Their purpose, too, is the same—to exalt the Church through the agency of the monks, and the bones of their departed saints.

We should be sorry to depreciate these Saxon monks unduly. We think that Mr. M'Cabe has successfully vindicated them from the unjust judgment of Mr. Laing, in his 'Chronicle of the Kings of Norway.' That gentleman declares his conviction that the northern invaders of the ninth century 'surpassed the cognate Saxon people they were plundering and subduing, in literature as much as in arms; that poetry, history, laws, social institutions, and usages, many of the useful arts, and all the elements of civilization and freedom, were existing among them in those ages, in much greater vigour than among the Anglo-Saxons themselves.' He adds that, 'the reader would almost ask if the Anglo-Saxons were not the barbarians of the two;' and he describes the invading power as 'the human mind in a state of barbarous energy and action, with the vitality of freedom, conquering the human mind in a state of slavish torpidity and superstitious lethargy.' The people were 'tamed down by the Church influence and superstition of four centuries, into a state of listless existence.' So that the Anglo-Saxons had become a people, to judge from their history, without national feeling, interest, or spirit, sunk in abject superstition.

'The spirit, character, and national vigour of the old Anglo-Saxon branch of this people had evidently become extinct under the influence and pressure of the Church of Rome upon the energies of the human mind. This abject state of the mass of the old Christianized Anglo-Saxons, is evident from the trifling resistance they made to small piratical bands of Danes or Northmen who infested or settled on their coasts. It is evident that the people had neither energy to fight, nor property, laws, nor institutions to defend, and were merely serfs on the

land of the nobles, or of the Church, who had nothing to lose by a change of masters.

‘Our early historians, from the Venerable Bede downwards, however accurate in the events and dates they record, and however valuable for this accuracy, are undeniably the dullest of chroniclers. They were monks, ignorant of the world beyond their convent walls, recording the deaths of their abbots, the legends of their founders, and the miracles of their sainted brethren, as the most important events in history; the facts being stated without exercise of judgment, or inquiry after truth; the fictions with a dull credulity, unenlivened by a single gleam of genius.’—P. 150.

Mr. M'Cabe intimates his opinion of this judgment by putting three notes of admiration at the end of the last paragraph. Notwithstanding this, we are constrained to express our conviction that the estimate of the *taming* and unmanning influence of the Church of Rome in the middle ages, and, indeed, in all ages, is substantially just; and we confess that our own opinion of the talents and attainments of the monks, is not much higher than that of Mr. Laing. But he has greatly and unaccountably wronged them in making them inferior in literature and civilization to the pagan Northmen. He says, ‘It will not surprise the reader to find that the mental energy of the latter was spent at home in history and poetry; but he will be surprised to find that those attempts surpass both in quality and quantity all that can be produced of Anglo-Saxon literature during the same ages, either in the Anglo-Saxon language, or in the Latin.’

Now during this period there was, undoubtedly, a considerable body of Anglo-Saxon literature, of which no one can doubt who has read Turner’s ‘History of the Anglo-Saxons,’ and Wright’s ‘Biographia Britanniae Literaria.’ Amongst the Latin poets were Aldhelm, Bede, Boniface, Leobgitha, Cena, Ethelwold, Alcuin; and amongst the historians were Gildas, Nennius, Aldhelm, Bede, Boniface, Eddius, Alcuin, Asser. During the period when these writers flourished—from the seventh to the tenth century—the Northmen had no written literature at all! ‘Until the beginning of the twelfth century,’ says Mr. Laing, ‘it was an oral, not a written literature.’ And he describes this oral literature of poetry, as a ‘monstrous description of battle and bloodshed, national in spirit, and void of sentiment or feeling—much of it so obscure that no meaning at all could be twisted out of it.’ He also admits that ‘with the introduction of Christianity came the use of written documents among the northern nations—that the scalds of the north disappeared at once when Christian priests were established through the country. They were superseded in their utility by men of education, who knew the art of writing. We hear little of the scalds after the first half of the twelfth century.’

Mr. M'Cabe is, therefore, fully entitled to draw the following

conclusions from Mr. Laing's own statements. 'First, that the Northmen, as pagans, had, previous to the establishment of Christianity, nothing deserving of the name of literature ; secondly, that with the spread of Christianity, came the first attempts at taking the Sagas out of the traditional state, and fixing them in writing (vol. i. p. 24) ; and thirdly, that with the extending influence of the Roman Catholic priesthood, we can identify the decline of piracy and the destruction of domestic slavery.'

Our dislike of the system of Romanism must not lead us to deny the benign and civilizing influence of Christianity, whose spirit is not wholly extinguished by the greatest abuses. To adopt the words of Lappenburg, 'The pen has ever triumphed over the sword, the olive over the laurel, mental culture over barbarian violence ; written language always prevails over unwritten ; and even the home of the Northmen is indebted for its alphabetical writing to the Anglo-Saxons.' *

According to the 'Catholic History,' the Anglo-Saxon period was an era of inspiration, of prophecy, and miracles. The gifts of the Spirit were poured out in ample measure upon the monks. Yet it was an age of public calamity, gross ignorance, and widespread demoralization. If the prophetic power of holy men had foretold the moment of desolating invasion, and guarded the people against it—if miracles had been wrought to save even the monasteries from spoliation and conflagration—to smite the ruthless foe with panic or with death—and if the extraordinary illumination from heaven had enabled even the monks to lead an exemplary life, such attestations to the supernatural accounts which the monastic historians have left us, would render them more worthy of credit.

We know that in those ages an opinion prevailed among ecclesiastics throughout Europe, that falsehood and imposture were lawful, if the design were to attach an ignorant people to the Church. Accordingly, multitudes of miracles were *got up* to serve some purpose of this kind, or to attract pilgrims to some shrine, where wonder-working relics were exhibited, as at Trèves in our own day. Sometimes enthusiastic men assumed that a miracle was performed, when all was the illusion of a diseased imagination ; and we fear that not a few cases of wilful murder occurred in order to make it appear that the vengeance of Heaven had fallen on some opponent of the monks.

There was a Witan, or Council, held at Kingesbyry, in the year 851, when 'it pleased Almighty God,' says the historian, 'that there should be worked a mighty miracle to the honour of the most holy Confessor St. Guthlac, by means of which *the devotion*

* Catholic History, pp. 150—154.

towards Croyland, which about this time had, in no slight degree, abated, should be revived, and thenceforth daily magnified in strength at all places and in all provinces. There prevailed then a dreadful disease, by which all classes were affected, and it had seized on not a few assembled in the Witan, which was occupied with a memorial from the Church of Croyland. Whilst 'all were busily engaged in mutual consultations respecting it, the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Ceolnoth, in a loud voice, cried out, that he had that moment been restored to health, through the merits of St. Guthlac, upon the affairs of whose monastery they were then discussing. His words were repeated by others—a great many, and those the most exalted at the Witan. Bishops, as well as ealderman and earls, affected by the same disease, declared that they, at the same time, through the mercy of God, and the merits of the most sanctified Guthlac, had been freed from all the pains with which their limbs had been afflicted, and all who were so cured bound themselves by vows, to make as speedily as they possibly could, *a pilgrimage to the sacred tomb of St. Guthlac.*'

It is impossible to say how far the facts of this case are truly recorded; but the matter was evidently preconcerted, in order to subserve a palpable interest. In virtue of this miracle, a royal charter was granted to Croyland, in which five bishops, including St. Swithin, record that they were miraculously cured. 'All the great men of the Witan, influenced by the example of the royal munificence, imitated it by affording proofs of their devotion to St. Guthlac. Then crowds of pilgrims visited his shrine with their offerings, and "the Lord so far poured down upon them the abundant showers of his saving grace, that sometimes even in a single day a hundred paralytics were restored to health." (P. 42).

St. Swithin was a great worker of miracles. At a time when he was the tutor of the reigning sovereign, and the chief counsellor of the throne, he was getting a bridge built at Winchester, and going one day to see how the work proceeded, he found a countrywoman weeping because the rude jokes and ruder sport of the workmen made her break a basket of eggs which she was taking to the market. The good saint might have given her the price of the eggs, and thus consoled her. But, instead of this, he made the sign of the cross over the basket, and gave it back to her, with its contents perfectly restored. Mr. M'Cabe says, that if he had 'any respect for the opinion of infidels, or any fear of their sneers, he should omit this anecdote respecting the good St. Swithin.' But why omit it if it is a great miracle? Our author may be assured that such miracles are greatly calculated to increase the number of 'infidels.'

St. Swithin performed more miracles when dead than when he was living. His body was raised by Bishop Ethelwold 110 years after his decease, on which occasion the history tells us that 'the senses of all present were pervaded with a most sweet and fragrant odour ; a blind woman was on the instant restored to sight ; and many afflicted with various diseases were cured through his merits. In less than a fortnight, one hundred and twenty-four persons were cured by him ! ' This lasted for five months, and the writer tells us he had *seen* more than two hundred sick persons restored to health in the course of ten days. He saw the streets round the monastery so crowded with the sick, that he could scarcely make his way through them to the gates ; and yet in a few days, all were cured off, and ' scarcely five ailing persons could be observed in the church.' Indeed, the merits of St. Swithin ' bestowed the blessings of health upon so many sick persons, that they may be considered as like the sands of the sea in numbers, numberless.'

On one occasion the Danes defeated the Saxons, and killed their king, Edmund, whose head they cast into the wood of Hoxon. A great multitude were collected together to search for it. They did not succeed for some time ; until all the seekers were attracted by the cry—' Here,—here,—here ;'—which proceeded from the dissevered head ! Upon this the monkish historian discourses thus :—' The tongue rendered mute by death, found utterance between the moveless lips and in the gaping mouth ; thus manifesting the magnitude of the incarnate Word, which once unloosed the jaws of the ass, in order that they might syllable the words of man, and rebuke the foolish prophet.'—(P. 137.)

The revivals of monastic religion forced by miracles, relics, and pious fabrications, were very transient in their nature. As means of grace nothing could be more barren. King Alfred found the country in a state of the greatest spiritual destitution. The following passage from Asser, the author of his life, is very remarkable :—

' In instituting this monastery (Athelney), the monarch found among his own subjects *no male person of noble rank, nor of free birth*—if we except infants who knew not how either to refuse what is good or reject what is bad—who was willing to take upon himself the monastic life. The desire for such a state had during the course of many preceding years completely disappeared not only amongst the West Saxons, but many other nations ; and this, although there still remained standing a great number of monasteries. Notwithstanding this, the rules of regular discipline were not adhered to ; and we know not wherefore, unless we attribute it to the invasion of the foreigners, who so very frequently and constantly assailed the inhabitants by sea and

overran the land, or that there was such an abundance of wealth among the people, that they looked down with contempt upon the poverty of the monastic life. Hence it was that the king had to endeavour and congregate within the walls of his monastery, monks of different nations, over whom he appointed as their first abbot and monk, John of Old Saxony. Albeit, that the king had procured some priests and deacons from places beyond the seas, still as he had not a sufficient number, he *purchased a great many slaves from the Gallic nation*, whose children he directed to be educated in this monastery, in order that in the course of time they might be worthy to wear the monastic habit.'—P. 239.

Thus low had fallen the Church of St. Augustine, so essentially monastic in its constitution and policy. The monkish life had become utterly contemptible, not from the causes assigned by Asser, but from the fact that the inhabitants of monasteries were the worst conducted and most immoral persons in the community; and by their fruits they were known and judged. Long after this the author of 'the Life of St. Dunstan' had to complain that—'the living in community was not then practised in England,—the custom of yielding obedience—of sacrificing one's own will to the will of others, was not adhered to. The name of abbot was one which was scarcely heard; a monastery of monks that which was seldom seen.' Yet no pains were spared to stimulate princes and people to this sort of zeal. Relics were exhumed and enshrined,—miracles were performed, visions were seen and related, kings were induced to grant magnificent endowments,—yielding themselves implicitly to the guidance of the bishops. They promulgated laws enforcing the observances of religion, and they set the example of extraordinary devotion by 'visiting the relics of the saints,' and praying in grave-yards at night. The Church and State system was carried out to the utmost perfection; and the great aim of the most eminent ecclesiastical rulers, was to establish and strengthen the monastic system. Innumerable were the pious frauds resorted to for the purpose of strengthening the faith of the ignorant multitude, and stirring up the piety of the self-indulgent monks. For example, a bishop named Birnstan was in the habit of walking nightly round the grave-yards, and on one occasion—when he prayed, 'May they rest in peace!—'he heard on a sudden, as if the voices of a multitudinous army burst out of their graves, and respond to him, in one single united *Amen!*'—(P. 386.) King Athelstan had his sword broken in a fight with the Danes; and when he stood in imminent peril of his life, the venerable Odo at once made it whole by a miracle.—(P. 413.) King Edmund, at full gallop on his hunter, in Windsor forest, was miraculously stopped short on the brink of a precipice, where the deer and the hounds had been just dashed to pieces, because in that

awful moment when death was before him, he repented of having done some injustice to St. Dunstan !’—(P. 433.)

In the year 946, ‘some clerks, seduced by a wicked error, attempted to assert that the bread and wine, when placed on the altar, remain after being consecrated in their former substance,’ &c. St. Odo convinced them one day at mass, by showing them the real and visible blood of Christ, dropping ‘from the fragments of the body of Christ, which he held in his hand.’—(P. 460.) Ethelwulf, when a bishop, joyfully narrated, ‘that when his mother was in a great crowd, she felt the Spirit of God penetrating his frame while yet unborn.’—(P. 467.) Concerning this man, St. Dunstan had an extraordinary, but characteristic dream. ‘He saw a tree so large, that it extended over all the British land, and all the branches of this tree were laden with *monk's cowls*, some large and some small, while over all, as the topmost fruit of all, was a cowl of enormous magnitude, that with its wide-stretched sleeves, seemed to shade all the other cowls, even as it rose up in pre-eminent grandeur and height, until it looked as if it touched the sky.’—(P. 469.) It is impossible to conceive a more natural dream for an ambitious abbot. He was told, however, that the gigantic cowl did not represent himself, but the monk Ethelwold. But Dunstan dreamed another dream on his own account, which he related next morning to the docile king, from whom it received the obvious interpretation, viz.,—‘So should you plainly know that you are to be the future prince of that see, which in Christ's name, is that of Canterbury, and that holds the highest rank among all the churches.’ Dunstan had before refused an inferior see; and lest this fact should be an obstacle, he took care to mention, that St. Peter, in the miraculous vision, had given him a slight blow of his staff, and said to him, ‘Be this the punishment for the rejected bishopric, and as a sign to you, that you are not to refuse again a bishop's mitre.’—(P. 489.)

Dunstan was persecuted by the wicked king Edwy; and when his ecclesiastical goods and property were subjected to confiscation, ‘there was heard on the western side of the church the harsh, ringing laugh of a demon, which sounded like the wheezy voice of gleesome hag.’ Another time, he knew that some evil had befallen the king, by the merry gambols, grinning, and capering of a demon, that exhibited before him as he rode along the highway.

Mr. M'Cabe labours, on several occasions, to show that the ‘clericis,’ who are repeatedly denounced in this work for their immoralities, were not ‘mass-priests’—not clergy, strictly speaking—but persons employed about the churches—an amphibious race, half priest and half layman; and contends that it is not

fair to involve the priesthood in the odium of their vices. But it is easy to refute this notion from his own work. If only the subordinates were demoralized, their superiors could easily have dismissed them. Besides, do not his own pages inform us that there were at that time (Edgar's reign), in the old monastery (at Winchester), canons so demoralized by the practice of the most abominable iniquities, and so perverted by pride, insolence, and luxury, that some of them would not deign to *say mass* when it was their duty to do so? that they repudiated wives whom they had, contrary to law, married, and then united themselves to other wives? and who were to be found incessantly wallowing in gluttony and drunkenness? (P. 545.)

The evil was not confined to a few places—it had spread over the nation. 'It was about this time (A. D. 970),' says Baronius, quoting the words of the preamble, 'that by the authority of Pope John, the Archbishop, Dunstan, collected a general council, and by their decree determined that *canons, priests, deacons*, and subdeacons, should either live chastely, or resign their churches.' (P. 574.)

From an admirable speech delivered by King Edgar, we learn what was the condition of the Anglo-Saxon Church in the tenth century. A due and diligent investigation had been made by this king into the lives and habits of bishops, clerical persons, and monks. Upon the result of this investigation being made known to him, the king summoned to his presence the heads of all the churches and monasteries, and then addressed to them a discourse. With a few extracts from his speech, we dismiss this instructive volume.

After referring to all that he had done to promote the interests of the Church, in compliance with the advice of the bishops and abbots, and especially of Dunstan, he complains bitterly of the unworthy priests, and strongly hints that the heads of the Church were much to blame:—

'With all due respect for you, reverend fathers, I say that if you had carefully and anxiously scrutinized into these matters, it is not possible that such horrid and abominable tales, respecting clerical persons, should have reached our ears. I pass by in silence their wantonness in attire, their impropriety in action, their looseness in language. How lamentably they neglected their attendance on the divine offices! . . . They abandon themselves to feasting and drunkenness, so that the houses in which those clerics dwell might be mistaken for the homes of harlots, the booths of buffoons, for in such may be heard the rattling of dice, the trampling of dancers, the roaring chorus of singers, marking out the line of their horrid vigils, which are constantly prolonged till midnight. Was it, I ask, for such purposes as these that our fathers exhausted their treasures? that royal exchequers were diminished in their revenues? did the royal munificence bestow lands and

goods upon the Church of Christ, that clerics should live in luxuries, that harlots should be bedizened, that sumptuous feasts should be eaten, that dogs, and falcons, and sporting gear should be purchased? The brave men of my land cry out against these things; the people murmur against them; mimes and mountebanks laud them; and you—will you any longer neglect to inquire into them? *Will you continue to spare them—to wink at them?*

After a most eloquent appeal to the consciences of his hearers, and a reference to the munificence of Alfred and other monarchs to the Church, he continues:—

‘And now—oh, wondrous alms—oh, precious purchase for a soul’s salvation! Oh, marvellous and efficacious remedy for our sins! Strumpets are found reposing in the cells of pilgrims, and our gifts decorate their fingers with rings, and our donations clothe them with fine linen and purple! Are such infamies as these the befitting fruits of my alms-deeds? Can such as these correspond with my hopes and your promises? I know well that you will not run with the thief, nor participate in the portion of the adulterer. Your exhortations have been disregarded; your prayers contemned; your threats set at defiance.’—Pp. 561—566.

ART. IV.—*Geschichte der Deutschen Reformation.* Von Dr. Phil. Konr. Marheincke, Berlin. (History of the German Reformation. By Phil. Konr. Marheincke, D.D., etc.) Berlin.

GERMANY was destined, by an all-wise Providence, to be the land in which the regeneration of the Christian Church was to commence. In Italy, men were likely to lose themselves in the world of antiquity, and to be surrounded with the magnificence and grandeur of the fine arts, without being aware of the chasm which had separated them from the actual state of things. In Germany the case was different. There the study of antiquity had, even at its commencement, another tendency, a chiefly moral effect. It had become a confederate of religious mysticism, and the preaching of moral doctrines. In proportion as it promoted clearness of thought, it also tempered the moral powers of the best minds in the land, until it finally brought the world back to the sacred writings. It was from this direction that the shock was to proceed which so powerfully affected the Papal chair, in order to bring the people who possessed at the time many sober views, to a clear perception of their real wants, and to

make them shake off those mechanical habits, and the degrading yoke, to which they had been subject for ages.

A work, therefore, on so stirring an event must be welcome at all times ; but never more so than when it combines the love of truth and luminous power with a deep kindly disposition, a rare profundity and acuteness with a vivid representation, and is the production of so enlightened and brilliant a mind as was that of the late Dr. Marheincke, Professor at the University of Berlin. We shall endeavour to place before our readers the result of our perusal of this delightful work, and submit our own opinion on the subject therein treated of ; referring, from time to time, to such Roman Catholic historical and other writers, as are distinguished for love of truth, and intense attachment to the Romish Church ; a proceeding which will save us from the accusation of one-sidedness and partiality.

Whoever is in the least degree acquainted with the history of the Middle Ages, must have perceived the springing up of the proud fabric of the hierarchy, and the Papal throne, which, as if by magic, reared its crest from the midst of it, until it ultimately surpassed every other power, both temporal and spiritual. Having sprung up slowly and inaudibly from an insignificant, and, at first, little regarded source ; strengthened and mightily raised by unusual circumstances, by genius, and the constant power of events ; confirmed by the most solemn acknowledgment of nations and their rulers, as well as by deeply-rooted prepossessions ; the Papacy seemed to rest on a foundation as firm as a rock. A considerable temporal power supported it, and, in all professed Christian lands, the various orders of monks and knights, who had become powerful through their immense wealth, nay, even the very universities, the nature of which, as spiritual corporations, rendered them subject to the Popes, maintained the predominance attached to the Roman See. The spirit of science and freedom, which had arisen from a long and death-like slumber, assumed, it is true, a menacing position towards it ; but had to succumb to Romish power and craft at the councils of Constance and Basle. Rejoicing at these achievements, the Papacy reigned in calm majesty, and seemed more secure than ever.

If we inquire into the state of the Papacy as it then existed in Germany, and into the so-called German Church of the periods preceding the Reformation, we shall find that of all the lands in Christendom, Germany was the one on which the ignominious yoke of Papal dominion pressed the heaviest. Spain, no doubt, groaned beneath the terrors of the Inquisition, and France was threatened by a return of former darkness, in consequence of Francis I. having renounced the Basle Decretals,

which had been received by the French Church. But in both these empires, a German historian tells us, it was more the will of the king than the power of the Pope which fettered the nation. The Church served either secular despotism, or policy. In Germany, however, the civil authority had been given up, for the greater part, to the ecclesiastical power. Many of the most notable princes of the empire were heads of the Church, and hence, in a most oppressive and scandalous dependence on the Pope. The Emperor was bound to an especial obedience to the Roman See, because of his being crowned by the Pontiff; and the only occasion to free himself and the country from so dis honourable a dependence had been suffered to escape by Ferdinand III. of Germany, who forced on the nation the wretched Concordat of Aschäffenburgh, which imparted to most of the Papal usurpations and extortions a legal validity. The tenor of this concordat, but more especially the famous 'Hundred Grievances of the German Nation' ('Centum Gravamina Nationis Germ. adv. Sedem Romanum'), which the spiritual and temporal states, assembled at the Imperial Diet at Nürnberg in 1523, placed before the Papal Legate, with the consent or sanction of Ferdinand, demanding their abolition as an unavoidable condition for the preservation of peace in the Church, give the clearest idea of the corruption of the German Roman Catholic Church, the degradation of the German State, and the power of the Papal chair in Germany.

In all parts of the country, prelates and churches, those that were invested with the dignity of princes, and such as were not, possessed, as proprietors and feofees, the finest and wealthiest estates; nay, the very sovereignty over extensive territories; whilst laymen hardly retained one-half; or, according to the 'Grievances,' one-third or fourth part of public property. With this immense power and wealth was coupled, an almost entire exemption from the burthen and duties of civil life, and the frequent committal of the most flagrant acts. When the clergy were not oppressive by their crimes or tyranny, they proved an unspeakable annoyance by an immorality which mocked all shame. All the historians of that and the preceding period agree in this respect; and even the most violent enemy of the Reformation, himself anything but a saint, the Jesuit and Cardinal Bellarmin, confesses, that 'a few years previous to the propagation of Luther and Calvin's heresy, there had been, according to the unanimous testimony of all the contemporaries, no rigour among the spiritual tribunals, no morality among the clergy, no knowledge of sacred things, no regard for God's commandments, and, generally speaking, almost no religion.'

A great portion of the wealth of the German clergy, and of

the laity, too, went to Rome under various paltry and ridiculous pretexts, which we can not stop to specify. Under such circumstances we need not be surprised that the desire for reformation increased daily; but Rome encompassed Europe with the net of her crafty policy, and thus frustrated the hopes of men. The Popes abandoned themselves more than ever to the pursuit of selfish objects, and, in many cases, to a policy most reprehensible under any circumstances, and in any body of men, but which appeared yet more atrocious in the heads of the Church. Paul II. commenced his reign by breaking the oath which he had taken previously to his elevation. 'The Popes,' says Rudelbach, at page 11 of his 'Savonarola,' 'heeded no longer the keeping of the oath, but regarded this very perjury as a papal prerogative; and as often as they promised previous to their election the abolishing of many abuses, and had undertaken to fulfil certain duties, they soon after asserted that all promises, oaths, and stipulations, aiming at a restriction of the power with which Christ has endowed his vicegerent, were null and void.' The following Pope, Sixtus IV., is described by a contemporary, chancellor of the city of Rome, as having been so shamefully covetous that he conferred no benefice unless it was paid for; that he generally bestowed it on the highest bidder; and had cardinalships and bishoprics always for sale. He accuses him, moreover, of the most unnatural and horrible lusts. Under the reign of his successor, Rome was over-crowded with prostitutes, murderers, and malefactors of every degree and shade; and whoever was able to pay for his crimes, remained unpunished, and even enjoyed the papal protection. Luther used frequently to say, that at Rome he heard people remark, *that if there existed a hell, Rome was built upon it.* But now came Alexander VI., the most profligate man that ever disgraced the papal chair, who, by his conduct and crimes, may justly be ranked with Nero and Heliogabalus. The acts of this monster are too revolting and atrocious for publication. Julius II., although distinguished for his talents as a worldly prince, was no ways inferior to the foregoing in some of the worst features of his character. Leo X. was a highly accomplished man, of a mild disposition, and an enthusiastic admirer and promoter of the fine arts; but, like his predecessors, he regarded the papal dignity as an excellent means towards leading a magnificent and joyous life.

'Cultivated, amiable, and peaceful,' says Cantu, a recent Roman Catholic writer, and an Italian, in speaking of this pope, 'he was an intellectual voluptuary. Sometimes he would listen to music, himself humming an accompaniment to the air; at others, he witnessed the representations of the comedies of

Macchiavelli and Bibiena, or assisted at the mock triumphs of the court fools, Querno and Baraballo. . . . He hunted during entire days at Viterbo and Corneto, fished at Bolsena, caressed Aretino and Ariosto. He accepted the dedication of the very immoral poem of the latter. . . . In short, he was a perfect gentleman, but a very bad pope. . . .

‘To indulge his family ambition, he intrigued with foreign princes, and was guilty of unheard-of rigours, so that the people said of him, “he rose stealthily like a fox, reigned like a lion, and ended like a dog.”’*

The same corruption had long taken possession of the clergy. All the historical works of that and the previous period abound with descriptions of their depravity, their pride, avarice, pomp, and luxury, and of the obdurate shamelessness, in consequence of which they considered it even unnecessary to conceal their vicious habits. No less great was the decline and immorality of the monastic institutions.

Without referring to all the historical writers of that period who complain of these corruptions, we shall quote a few Italian and German Roman Catholic writers of a somewhat different description, namely, priests and poets, who, with all their attachment to the Romish Church, have exposed the hideous character of the men who disgraced the Church. Even so early as the fourteenth century, there were men who unmercifully castigated both the clergy and the popes. Among the Italians who thus called both to an account, particular mention must be made of

Dante Alighieri, the greatest Italian poet. In his ‘*Divina Comedia*,’ which consists of three parts, namely, the Hell, Purgatory, and Paradise, he sends the popes, as a matter of course, to the first, since he considers them to have no business in the last, and suffers no occasion to pass without inflicting severe wounds on the gross immorality and ignorance of the Romish clergy.

Giovanni Boccaccio, the celebrated poet and priest, whose ‘*Decamerone*’ contains numberless satirical attacks upon, and allusions to, the monks, auricular confession, saints, relics, and purgatory.

Poggio Bracciolini, who had been, during a period of ten years, Apostolic Secretary to the Roman See, and had been present at the Council of Constance, where he much admired the firmness of *Jerome of Prague*, of which he gives an impartial account in one of his letters. He wrote a work, entitled, ‘*De Humanu Conditionis Miseria*,’ in which he exposes, in a terrible manner, the vices of the monks, cardinals, and popes.

Giovanni Baptista Spagnolo, a poet and general of the order

* Reformation in Europe, vol. i. pp. 9, 10.

of Carmelites, a most pious and zealous defender of God's holy word, was one of the greatest adversaries of the Romish clergy. It is most surprising how the writings of this man, in which he severely exposes the Roman hierarchy, escaped the notice of the Inquisition. In one of his poems, 'Alphonsus,' occurs a conversation between the soul of Pope Sixtus IV., in purgatory, and his tormenting spirit, the devil Jupiter, which is as forcible as it is highly satirical.

Lodovico Ariosto, the Homer of the Italians, shows as little mercy to the popes in his 'Orlando Furioso.' But he nowhere treats the Romish clergy with more severity than in his 'Seven Letters,' which he dedicates to his brothers and friends, and which may be considered as the production of his mature and manly age. It is impossible to dwell on each of his writings; we, therefore, recommend them, and the writings of all the other Italian satirists, for a careful perusal. Speaking, in his fifth 'Letter,' of conjugal life, and proving that the absence of it must be conducive to all manner of sins, he says, 'and hence it is that the priests are so insatiable and cruel a rabble.'

‘———— e quindi avvien, che i Preti
Sono si ingorda e si crudel canaglia.’

We might fill whole pages with the names of those Italian Catholic writers who devoted their best energies to abate the gross ignorance, immoralities, and abominations which existed for centuries among the Romish clergy, in Italy, Spain, Portugal, Poland, and especially in the Papal States. Sufficient specimens, however, have been given to show what the state of things was even in Italy itself. Of the German Catholic writers, who are no less free in their censures on the heads and members of the Romish hierarchy, we regret that our space will permit our doing little more than specify some names.

Bernardus Westerodus, a monk, belonging to the fourteenth century, who lived at Corvey, wrote a work, entitled 'Planctus,' *i.e.*, lamentation, wherein he forcibly describes the corruption and ignorance of the clergy, in terms which must have been specially offensive to them.

Johann Geiler von Keysersberg, a priest and doctor in divinity, was considered by his contemporaries as the most learned man of his age. Flacius counts him among the witnesses of the truth as it is in God, because he saw the corrupt state of the Church, and hesitated not to tell the monks that their dissolute life was the cause of all existing crimes and sinfulness. He compared the *black* monks with devils, the *white* ones with the devil's mother, and all the rest with his chickens. He was one of those who

strongly urged a reformation of the Church, and declared publicly, that although he himself might not witness, perhaps, this event, many of his auditors would. Nor was he mistaken.

Johann Reuchlin, or *Capnio*, the restorer of literature and science in Germany, and one of the greatest scholars of the day, was the author of 'Sergius,' a comedy, in which the monks and priests were handled very roughly.

Johann Crotus, who was regarded at one time as the sole author of the celebrated 'Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum,' but who composed only part of those letters, while the remainder were written by Ulrich von Hutten and others. It was this Crotus who urged Hutten to attack in satires the bishops of Germany, the result of which was, that both of them composed a number of satirical dialogues, epigrams, &c., against the Romish clergy of that period. Amongst the various productions of Hutten was one in which Julius II. is represented after his death, as wishing to enter heaven; but is prevented by St. Peter, who alleges that Julius is a drunkard, murderer, simoniac, poisoner, and voluptuary, and suffering from a certain disease which is unfit for publication. There are many other writings of the same character from the pen of this illustrious man, the bare mention of which we must omit for want of space.

But to return. As the purity of the gospel life had been sullied by the vicious habits of the priesthood, so had also the knowledge of the gospel been lost through their ignorance. Theological learning was very rare. 'During my youth,' says a trustworthy writer of the fifteenth century, 'there was hardly one in a thousand clergymen *who had even seen* a university.' Even the knowledge which most possessed of the word of God, was very mean and scanty; and when the original Hebrew and Greek texts of the Bible became more known, and thus formed a subject for the study of the learned, the monks endeavoured, with all their might, to run it down as a new and dangerous kind of heresy. So much did these men fear the danger accruing to the prevailing system from an earnest inquiry into the Bible! There are still extant express prohibitions of the sacred writings to the youth frequenting the schools, because this pure source of the Christian faith was to be withheld entirely from the people, and instead of the gospel faith, there was to be a Christianity wholly consisting of rites and ceremonies, the main tendency of which was to enslave the mind and eclipse the gospel. In Italy, where classical learning had revived, and taken up its abode, this tendency of the mind proved to Christianity more injurious than useful. One would be led to the belief, that Christianity had entirely forsaken that land, had a religious spirit not been manifested in those magnificent and stupendous works of art that were

created during that period. To the learned, however, who only revelled in Homer and Plato, Virgil and Cicero, the word of the Cross was a subject of contempt, which was *good only for the multitude*. They had appropriated to themselves the pagan sentiments and pagan wisdom, with which their views of the relations of human life absolutely teemed. ‘The spirit of Paganism,’ says Signor Cantu, ‘had, however, penetrated even into the Pontifical court. Men of genius found favour there without regard to the use they made of their talents. Bembo writes from the Apostolic chancery that Leo X. had assumed the Pontificate, by a decree of the immortal gods; and speaks of vows to the Goddess of Fame, of appeasing the manes of the subterranean gods, of the spirit of the celestial Zephyr. Bishop Cornelius Musso said shortly afterwards, that the prelates must repair to the Council of Trent, as the warriors of Greece assembled in the wooden horse. Sadoleto, who is considered one of the best men of that century, has an essay addressed to Camerarius, to console him on the death of his mother, in which he dwells on intrepidity and pagan magnanimity, without one allusion to the far more efficacious arguments furnished by religion.’

We have seen how solid the foundation of the Papacy was, and how secure she considered herself in consequence. How came it to pass, therefore, that this power was shaken to its very foundation, humbled and subdued? Whence came that power? Who was it that achieved what emperors and kings, nations and councils, were unable to effect? All this was done without terrestrial aid. It was effected solely by the power of *truth*, favoured by circumstances, ordained by an all-wise Providence. All this was the will of Providence; or, to speak with a Roman Catholic writer, ‘in this way’ ‘was fulfilled the great and fundamental law of nature, according to which the idea is stronger than the external power, the excess and abuse of which is certain to prove its own destruction, and which, if opposed to the spirit of the time, will always rest on a hollow foundation, and only accelerate its certain downfall.’ Herein, then, lies the first and foremost ground of the Reformation—the ever-living power of the human mind, which may be suppressed for a while by institutions and usages, or become corrupt in the progress of time, but can never be stifled for ever.

The sale of indulgences was one of the causes of the Reformation in Germany. Indulgence signified in the most ancient Church, a remission or pardon of the punishment imposed by a church, bishops, or synods, on a sincere repentance and true reclamation. Gradually, however, the notion obtained, that any good work, such as almsgiving, fasting, pilgrimages, and the like, might be substituted for penance, and the bishops began,

accordingly, to remit a portion of the imposed penance to those who contributed money toward some pious object.* The origin of this custom in Germany must be sought for in a very ancient principle in the penal law of the Germans, according to which the remission of the greatest crimes could be obtained for a specific sum of money. The ancient Church was, indeed, very careful not to be exposed to the charge of self-interest ; for the money received in this way was applied to assist the poor, &c.—(S. Plank's 'Geschichte der Christlich-kirchlichen Gesellschaftsverfassung, vol. ii. p. 295, and vol. iii. p. 678.) An abuse, moreover, of this custom was prevented, in a great measure, by the circumstance of every sin demanding a particular penance, *i.e.*, particular mode of redemption. But all this assumed a different aspect as soon as the popes, on occasion of the Crusades, came forward with an entire remission of every sin (*indulgentia plenaria*), for all those who would take part in the holy wars. Very soon, the remission was extended to others, agreeably to the will and judgment of different popes. The Church, it is true, understood her pardons to have respect only to the penances imposed. She declared that the remission can be efficacious only to those who repented inwardly, and were firmly resolved to lead henceforth a godly life. But in consequence of the great importance attached to this remission, it was natural that men should ultimately be led to the belief, that by the mere fulfilment of the condition prescribed, they would escape the Divine punishment. In order to establish their theory of a general indulgence, the scholastics invented the doctrine of a *superabundant treasure of the merits of Christ and the saints*. Here was a doctrine, as wicked as it was absurd and unscriptural, which, ultimately, proved a rich mine to the papal chair. The result was, that the papal forgiveness of sin had never been announced with more solemnity, or in such splendour, as at the jubilee of 1300, which was held at Rome, by command of Boniface VIII., when millions of human beings crowded thither to obtain the forgiveness of their sins. 'He granted to all those who would come repently in the course of this year to the churches of the Apostles *Peter* and *Paul*, or would do so in the following hundredth year, not only a plenary, but the *most plenary* (*plenissimum*) forgiveness of sins.' The result was extraordinary. From all lands belonging to the Western Church, immense crowds were on their way to Rome, from whom the Holy See and the inhabitants of that

* The writer above referred to, having watched the deadly and immoral results of indulgences at Rome, concludes his well-meant and pithy remarks concerning this abominable practice, by saying, 'Whoever invented this mode of pardoning sins, will prove a curse to the human race, as long as a trace of his doctrines remains.'

city derived so much benefit, that Clement VI. resolved not to await the end of the century for a repetition of it, but to celebrate the next jubilee in the year 1350. The number of pilgrims who came to Rome up to Easter of that year, amounted, according to the statement of a contemporary, the Florentine historian, *Villani*, from ten to twelve hundred thousand; and according to others, to between two and three millions; an event which afforded the highest satisfaction to the inhabitants of Rome.—(S. Schröckh's 'Kirchengeschichte,' vol. xxxiii. p. 464.) Nor were the following popes satisfied even with this change; for, Urban VI., in 1389, appointed the jubilee to take place every thirty-three years, and Paul II., in 1470, reduced it to five-and-twenty. When the notorious Alexander VI. celebrated it in the year 1500, he declared in his proclamation, 'that he would, from a paternal inclination, render likewise aid to the souls that were in purgatory.' He, therefore, granted the plenary indulgence to the souls in purgatory for a complete remission of their punishment, provided Christians would give some alms during the jubilee in favour of the departed souls. The assertion, that the efficacy of indulgence extended to purgatory, was not new, only it received at this time, its confirmation, by means of a papal decision. And this was done by a pope, who stood more in need of divine mercy, than any one of the infatuated thousands who thankfully received the forgiveness of sin at his hand.

The weapons of attack on existing abuses were rendered more efficacious by the awakened spirit of inquiry already alluded to, and by the part now taken even by laymen in scientific researches. The studies of the *humaniora* did not in Germany, as in Italy, promote a pagan disposition and mode of thinking; on the contrary, men fixed their attention upon the benefit to be derived from the new culture to religion. It was in this sense that the Germans, especially those who were celebrated as the revivers of such studies in Germany, viz., *Rudolph Agricola*, *Konrad Celtis*, *Johann Reuchlin*, *Johann von Dalberg*, *Ulrich von Hutten*, and *Pirkheimer*, acted.

Among the men who prepared the way for the Reformation, was the well-known *Erasmus of Rotterdam*, a man who, besides great and profound learning, possessed the rare talent of a clear mode of representation, the result of an intimate acquaintance with the works of the ancients. He attacked, in his numerous works, the notorious evils of the religious state, the scandalous life of the clergy, and their pitiable ignorance, at one time with admonishing earnestness, and at another in a tone of annihilating derision. Yet his love of peace, and aversion to decided measures, would always have prevented—apart from other things—his working out a reformation in the Church. This was reserved

for a man whose eloquence was less finished and tasteful, as his learning was less brilliant and comprehensive, but whose soul was filled with a zeal which qualified him for the greatest actions, and carried along with him thousands prepared to face every difficulty, and to stand up boldly against every danger. This man was Martin Luther. It was in the year 1517 that Leo X., who needed money for the dowry of his sister Margaret, resolved to proclaim an indulgence under the plea of erecting the church of St. Peter. The country upon which he relied most was Germany, but he soon found his confidence to be unfounded, and realized its just punishment.

Albrecht, elector of Brandenburg, and archbishop of Mayence, and Magdeburg, who was not inferior to the Pope in extravagance, and who owed Leo X. some money for *pallia*, took on himself a lease of this sale of indulgences, thinking to liquidate this debt with the profit accruing from it. He appointed the Dominican friar, John Tetzel, as his agent, who was a grand inquisitor, and distinguished for impudence and scandalous conduct. He was talkative and adroit in affecting the mob; a stout zealot, skilled in every mean trick, and indefatigable whenever his covetousness or hatred was concerned. He traversed Saxony with two immense chests, one of which contained his merchandise, the papal letters of indulgence, while the other received the money obtained from his dupes. In all the towns and villages through which he passed, he exposed his merchandise for sale, and had usually by the side of him a large fire, or a cross raised.

Although confirmed by the greatest authorities, the expressions with which Tetzel praised the indulgence, and allured purchasers of this atrocious *stuff*, appear fabulous, because too revolting for the human understanding and feelings. All sins, even the most horrible, and such as could be conceived only by the most wicked and licentious imagination, obtained forgiveness on paying the merest trifles; and not only were the indulgence-letters to prove efficacious to the living, but also to the dead, in whose name they were purchased.

‘Indulgences,’ Tetzel said, ‘are the most precious and most sublime gifts of God . . . This cross (pointing to a red cross he had near him), has the same efficacy as the actual cross of Jesus Christ . . . Come, and I will give you letters under seal, by which even the sins which you may have a desire to commit in future will all be forgiven . . . I would not exchange my privilege for that of St. Peter in heaven, for I have saved more souls by my indulgences than the apostle by his sermons.* There is no sin

* It ought to be ‘by his Gospel.’

too great for an indulgence to remit ; and even should any one (the thing, no doubt, is impossible), have violated the holy Virgin Mary, mother of God, let him pay—let him only pay well, and it will be forgiven him.

‘ But more than this ; indulgences not only save the living, they also save the dead. For this repentance is not even necessary.’

Sensible and pious men heard his preaching with anger and indignation, and witnessed with sadness the concourse that came to him. The voice of many was zealously raised against his traffic, and the princes complained of the gross imposition practised on their subjects, and of their lands being impoverished. From the little town of Friburg alone, Tetzel carried away two thousand florins ; and yet, as if spell-bound, no one dared raise his voice in public against so highly authorized and prescriptive a superstition. The popes had already practised this juggling more than once with impunity. But they were to do so no longer ; for Providence now awakened a man who made them atone for their many crimes, frauds, and perversities.

When Luther perceived the pernicious effects of indulgences in his own neighbourhood, he at first opposed the sale in his sermons, and wrote to all the neighbouring bishops, entreating them to forbid the exercise of so great an imposture. But as no notice was taken of this remonstrance, he affixed on the evening of the 31st of October, 1517, on the door of the castle-church of Wittenberg, his celebrated ninety-five Theses, the main object of which was to refute the validity of indulgence. He, moreover, challenged to a public disputation all such as were well informed on the point at issue, and were anyways disposed to enter the lists. These Theses were the basis of a world-changing revolution.

‘ The contents of these Theses,’ says a celebrated Roman Catholic historian, ‘ nay, even those of most of the subsequent doctrines of Luther—those, perhaps, on primacy, and a few others belonging to scholastic theology, excepted—are of such a nature as to be professed by all enlightened Roman Catholics, either publicly or in private, even in the present day. And with regard to the arrogations of Rome and the corruptions of the Church, we may safely say, that were they now-a-days the same which they were at the time of Luther, any reformer coming forward in his spirit (provided that enlightenment had attained the point on which we now see it, in spite of that corruption), would be certain of the approbation of *nine-tenths* of the whole Roman Catholic world.’

‘ The wretched accusation,’ the same writer observes, ‘ that Luther was vexed at the Dominican friars, on account of the

profit which they derived from this indulgence-business, and that his attack was the result of envy displayed by his order, and secretly instigated by his provincial, we must mention only in a note. It is hardly worth a serious and profound refutation, which it has met with in many writings, especially in Charles Villiers's 'Essai sur l'Esprit et l'Influence de la Réformation de Luther.' To this we ourselves may add, that among the first, if not *the* first who accused Luther of having raised this outcry concerning the sale of indulgences from envy against the Dominican friars, was one *Hieronymus Emser*, a native of Ulm. This he asserted in a work which he founds upon the assumption that the Augustin order had been first commissioned with this dirty business, and had been deprived of it by the Dominicans. This wretched fabrication is altogether untrue, inasmuch as the Franciscan friars were the first that were commissioned by the papal bull. And they not only suffered it to pass over into the hands of the Dominicans, but zealously endeavoured to rid themselves of it.

The ninety-five Theses soon spread like wild-fire throughout Germany, and were reprinted, copied, translated, and read with the utmost avidity. Many admired the man who had the courage to utter publicly such opinions; while others, among whom there were some of the most distinguished, observed a solemn silence. As for the bishops, and the clergy in general, they expressed loudly their discontent at Luther's doings. Those who wished him well advised him to keep his peace; for even the best informed were of opinion that no good would accrue. When the Saxon historian, *Albert Kranz*, saw these Theses, he said to Luther, 'Frater, abi in cellam et dic miserere mei;' nor was he the only one who thus expressed himself. A spark, however, had fallen among the German people, which, from the ill-will and little harmony that prevailed between the magistrates and the bishops, and the great increase of culture among the people, grew very speedily into a blaze.

Luther himself at this time was very far from wishing to shake the entire fabric of the hierarchy; he himself confesses, that he was 'so intoxicated, nay, drunk, with the dogmas of the pope, that he could almost have killed any one who dared refuse obedience to the pope, though it were only with a single syllable. Only, in selling indulgences, he thought the holy father abused his power, and here it was his duty to interpose, and to set him right according to the holy Scriptures.'

To refute the charges which have been advanced against Luther and the Reformation, would be an unnecessary waste of time. Instead of this, we purpose inquiring into Luther's character,

which we shall do from a fivefold point of view ; as a *reformer of the Church*, a *translator of the Bible*, the *composer of sacred songs*, a *preacher and prose writer*, and, finally, as a *reformer of the German language, and author in general*. We shall inquire, moreover, into the results of all this upon German literature and morals.

1. *Luther as a reformer of the Church.* The mirror of Luther's character, the key to all his actions, and the real standard for forming a correct estimate of him, must be sought in his writings, and in the state of things then. Luther did not appear as an assaulter either of the Church or State ; he did not raise the banner of a superfine and sceptical reasoning, which mocks everything good and holy ; neither was vanity, or the wish to 'shine' as a founder of sects, the motive that animated him. He was a man of a profound nature, endowed with a rich spirit, freed from the fetters of prejudice by a clear, contemplative mind ; perceiving, in truth, the corruptions of his Church, and called upon by religious impulse, as well as by talent, to resist the prevailing evils. He was altogether a vigorous expression of his age, and well suited to act in the spirit of it. There were many others who thought and felt like him ; some, like Erasmus, surpassed him in learning, and others, again, in moderation and refined manners. The very foibles of Luther contributed, probably, to his success. So prepared was the world for his mission, that had he not appeared, another would have undertaken his task, and, favoured by similar circumstances, would have achieved it. It was the thing itself, the IDEA, which produced such mighty results, and not the personal power of the man. Luther was strong, because he served the cause of truth, and the spirit of the time. Thousands were with him, because he spoke after the mind of thousands ; he was, in some measure, rather the standard-bearer than the master of this war. Besides, the plan and conception of the whole, when he entered the lists, was anything but clearly conceived in his soul. His adversaries, who provoked him with bitter abuses and persecution, compelled him to proceed to extremes ; and thus, the dispute which at first turned on some theological points, gradually extended to the whole authority of the pope.

Never was man more slandered than Luther. Whole volumes might be filled with inventions, no small portion of which belongs to the semi-papists of Oxford. In pursuing their course, the enemies of Luther have injured no one more than themselves, inasmuch as even the truths they utter, assumed in consequence the appearance of lies. Whatever Luther wrote or said, is heresy. When he complains of the temptations of the devil, they infer that the devil was his teacher. If he defends matrimony, they apply to him epithets which are unfit for publication.

Because he married, he was guilty of sacrilege. What a hue and cry his opponents raised in consequence of his changing his views on certain doctrines, and how Cochlæus, one of his fiercest adversaries, exulted on his denying, in after life, the doctrines of purgatory, prayers for the dead, and others, which he had maintained at an earlier period. But what says Luther? He makes no secret of the matter, but in one of his publications, entitled, 'Garaus von dem Endchrist,' says, 'I myself confess, that I was from the commencement undecided concerning indulgence, the Pope, the Romish Church, the Councils, high schools, and spiritual rights, and therefore have revoked all this in some books of mine, which I published subsequently.' Whatever Luther said in a figurative sense, was interpreted in the strictest sense of the word. The 'Table-talk,' which he had neither written, nor even seen, is represented by his adversaries as the 'confession of his faith,' and is brought forward to prove the *monstrous notions* he had of eternal life.

He is accused by his adversaries, and even by his would-be admirers, of severity and rudeness of speech. This we are little inclined to deny. His severity was the result of the scandalous calumnies that were heaped upon him, and of the thousand ways in which his enemies endeavoured to excite his temper. At first, he wrote and spoke with moderation—indeed, he was naturally mild and affable, and very far from an irritable disposition; but when he saw that he had to deal with men on whom modesty, courtesy, and moderation, were thrown away, he assumed a tone better adapted to silence their malice. Goëthe says, 'Wer den Teufel erschrecken will, der muss laut schreien' (he who would frighten the devil must shout loudly). This Luther has done, and nothing more. The rudeness imputed to Luther must be estimated according to the genius of a period, in which every controversialist was rude. Eccius, Emser, Cohlæus, and others, in their contests with Luther, employed expressions, which, for rudeness and coarseness, are unsurpassed by the vilest Billingsgate. Erasmus, speaking in his defence, said, 'In these our times, in which great and severe epidemic diseases and infirmities prevail, God hath given to the world a hard and severe physician.' And a lawyer of Strasburg, Ottmar Luscinius, who lived at the time of Luther, and was a zealous Roman Catholic, blames him for the hard expressions he used against the pope; but yet he considers him as a man whom even his impugners must regard as 'excellent, true-hearted, and eloquent, who had been so much excited to an unusual severity by the empty talkers, that he was compelled to lay aside his otherwise habitual modesty.'

His opponents accuse him, moreover, of levity, and a sportive

humour in serious matters ; more especially of deriding the customary scholastic manner of disputing. Some Jesuit, we do not remember his name, as if to scoff at Luther, called it a *Lucianic wit*, as though this redounded, if such really were the case, to Luther's dishonour. This sophistic manner of controversy was at that time the palladium of Luther's opponents ; whenever they took the field thus arrayed, they deemed themselves a match for the whole world. But the great reformer had too much good natural sense to suffer himself to be misled by this childish and wretched way of inquiring into truth, or of defending it. When dealing with such perplexed and crack-brained minds, Luther thought a serious refutation was of no use. He effected more by derision, imitating the example of Socrates, when dealing with the sophists of Greece.

2. *Luther as a translator of the Bible.* His translation of the Bible forms a most important feature in his reformation. A church, which declares the holy Scriptures to be the only rule of faith and life, and which obliges every professor of Christianity diligently to read and search it, necessarily required a translation in the vernacular tongue. This immense task was achieved by the great reformer. Hence, to understand the whole energy, eloquence, and power of Luther's mind, it would be well to study his translation of the Bible. In this translation, especially in that of the Old Testament, Luther displays his wonderful powers to the greatest advantage. All this was the result of immense labour. He himself confesses to have taken vast pains, and to have frequently sought for whole days together, for expressions which corresponded faithfully with the original. That no one before him ever penetrated more deeply into the spirit of the sacred writers, that no one interpreted with so much fire and feeling, beauty and fidelity, we may soon perceive on comparing his translation with those made before him in the German dialect. Some German divines, such as Hetzel, Michaelis, Augusti, Bahrdt, De Wette, &c., have endeavoured to improve this translation ; yet Luther's Bible maintains its authority in the German Protestant Church, and will probably ever continue to do so.

How touching are the remarks he makes concerning the pains he took to render this translation worthy to be placed in the hands of the people. In his missive on interpretation, he says, 'I have endeavoured in my translation to give a pure and clear German. It frequently happened that we (himself and fellow-labourers), had to seek and inquire for a fortnight, three and four weeks, for a single word, and yet have not found it sometimes after all. In Job, we laboured in such a way, that I, M. Philip, and Aurogallus, could scarcely compose three lines in four days.

Beloved, now that it is translated, and is ready, every one reads and finds fault with it.' In another place, he says, ' If any one runs over three or four leaves, he finds no fault ; but he is unaware of the rocks and stumbling-blocks that lay where he now passeth, as over a planed board ; how we have perspired and fretted before we succeeded in removing out of the way these rocks and stumbling-blocks, in order that men might comfortably walk along. It is easy to plough when the field is cleared of its impurities ; but to eradicate the forest, and stems of trees, and to prepare the field, after things such as these no one lusts.' An ancient writer, Matthesius, relates, that Luther, during his translation of the descriptions of the sacrifices given in the Old Testament, had several sheep killed, in order to learn from the butcher the name of every part of the animal.

3. *Luther as a composer of sacred songs, and as a preacher.* He was not only endowed with a brilliant mind, but possessed, also, a feeling heart. His was, so to speak, a deep feeling nature, and, therefore, well suited for sacred poesy. This is proved not only by his version of the Psalms and other poetical writings of the Bible, but, likewise, by his own sacred poems. Their number is, no doubt, small (they amount only to thirty-eight), among which are some translations from the Latin ; but almost all breathe a deep religious sentiment, and show what this man of God would have achieved, had his inquiring spirit not been absorbed by occupations and doctrines of a more serious and elevated character. We cannot enumerate all his poetical compositions ; and our space precludes our giving any sample of his poetic style. The poem in which we find so touchingly and vividly expressed the whole personality of this man, and the power of his faith, is his well-known composition, entitled, 'A Strong Tower is our God.'

Nor was Luther less distinguished as a preacher. A captious criticism, judging by the rules of a super-refined age, will, no doubt, discover faults in his manner of preaching, but his sermons are penetrated by a biblical spirit, a frankness, a warm-heartedness, a truly religious sentiment, such as not only edified, but produced a lasting impression on his hearers. Luther, far above the spirit of his age, had peculiarities of his own, and would, at times, condescend to a certain degree of popularity, and in so far approximate some modern preachers. But, then, he differs from them, inasmuch as he knew the secret of imparting to his discourses a fulness of spirit, and that strict fidelity to revealed religion, which distinguishes the true follower of Christ. A proof of this we find, amongst others, in his four sermons on Death, Resurrection, and the Day of Judgment, which he preached at Wittenburg, in 1544 and 1545. There is

a *naïveté* and simplicity about these orations, which, notwithstanding the difference of our habits and mode of thinking, must always excite our love and admiration. All the sermons of Luther differ much from those of subsequent ages, when preachers of Christian love became the most inveterate and zealous persecutors, and the pulpits resembled the ships of Hannibal, that were filled with serpents and adders; when religious feuds became the order of the day, and threw the Church into a state of universal confusion.

4. *Luther as a prose-writer.* ‘Luther wished to strike,’ as Müller says, in his ‘Ode to the Germans,’ ‘with the sword of language.’ For this purpose he wanted the form of speech of the German prose, which until then had been little cultivated, and only rhetorically fostered, by Tauler, during the fourteenth century. It was used by Albert Dürer for strictly scientific purposes, but was known only to few, and not employed by any. The power which dwelt in Luther, obtained here, as everywhere else, the most signal victory. His prose style is without constraint and natural, pithy and concise, harmonizing, in colour and tone, with the matter it contains. His writings fully deserve careful study and the serious attention of every well-cultivated mind. The peculiarity of his style is seen to great advantage in his ‘Sermons,’ ‘Tracts,’ ‘Table-talks,’ ‘Missives,’ and ‘Familiar Letters;’ but still more in his satirical and polemical writings, in which he appears as the champion of God and Christ. Here he is quite at home, and may be considered as the first who pointed out, not only to the Germans, but to the world at large, how controversy may be carried on with dignity. Discarding personalities, he keeps in view the opinion of his opponent, and is thus raised above every other polemico-satirical writer of his period. He is frequently, no doubt, blunt, cutting, and very bitter, but the malignity and wickedness of his adversaries form an ample excuse for such ebullitions. Against them he calls in the entire force of language. This is particularly the case in his writings, entitled, ‘Wider der neuen Abgott und alten Teufel, der zu Meissen soll erhoben werden,’ a work full of noble wrath and keen wit; ‘Ellische Sprüche wider das Concilium Obstatiense;’ ‘Ernste zornige Schrift Dr. M. Luther’s wider M. Simon Lemnius Epigrammata;’ ‘Wider Hans Wurst,’ 1541; and others.

5. *Luther, as the reformer of the German language, and author in general.* He is not only distinguished as a religious hero, but belongs, in an especial manner, to the history of German literature, language, and eloquence. If it be impossible to conceive of a thorough reform of the Church in Germany without a stirring of the intellectual powers in general, much less pos-

sible is it not to perceive the influence which Luther exercised on these through the culture of the German language, which he impressed with the character of his own noble and straightforward mind. This is fully borne out by the whole course of the Reformation, and more especially by the tone, spirit, and style of his writings. Nor would it be difficult to prove the influence he exercised on philosophy, inasmuch as he broke the fetters of the Aristotelian scholasticism, and thus delivered theology from the trammels and oppression of the Church. A German philosopher of great repute says, that philosophy has become through him, so as to speak, a *Protestant science*. His influence on language, and on education, by means of his translation of the Bible, and his Catechisms, was undoubtedly of a mighty and beneficial character. His merits, even in this respect, are very great, and cannot be denied even by Roman Catholics, however hostilely disposed towards the great reformer.

If we examine Luther's writings, we shall soon discover, that they are a pure impression of his profound nature, in most beautiful harmony with his peculiar character. The fire of his temperament, the heroic virtue of his acting, the magnanimity and rectitude of his sentiments, the love of God and man which pervaded his whole being, and the firm belief in the success of his cause which was founded upon it, were the main elements of his nature, which for this reason could not but act externally with more vigour than tenderness, and express themselves in a certain bluntness which bordered at times on severity and roughness.

His whole manner of writing is the pure effusion of a strong mind, which poured forth each of its feelings, despising external consideration, and having in view only what was conceived to be right and true. Hence, he imparted to language his own tone and power, brilliancy and strength, his spirit and life. Hence, too, he is unsurpassed in the sublime and grand ; ever brief and manly, whenever he is the herald of Truth, and fiery and penetrating, whenever he writes or speaks feelingly.

In speaking of the Reformation, men are in the habit of associating with Luther's name that of Melanchthon, and others ; forgetting all the while that there is a name which, if not superior and more important, is certainly not inferior to any of them.—Ulrich von Hutten was one of the brightest luminaries of the sixteenth century, to whom the Protestant world are greatly indebted for the part he took in the movement under notice. We should be found wanting in our duty, therefore, were we not to dwell upon this extraordinary character, and point out to the reader one of the most remarkable instruments destined by an all-wise Providence for carrying out certain ideas, the main end of which was to benefit mankind.

A nobleman by birth, and Master of Arts, Hutten was a zealous admirer and defender of all that is right and good ; had ever at heart the German freedom ; and since 1517,—if not before—the Reformation. Having been three times in Italy and Rome, he had observed the doings of the clergy and the Roman Curiæ ; in consequence of which he became one of the most inveterate enemies of the heads of the Romish church, and of the clergy in general ; and never omitted an occasion to expose their gross immoralities and ungodly life. More than any other man of the period, Hutten resembled Luther as an exalted and powerful character, the representative of the humanists of his age, and as the chivalrous defender of mental and moral freedom.

Destined for the Church, von Hutten was sent to the Cloister-school of Fulda, where he laid the foundation of that profound learning, which subsequently rendered him one of the most illustrious men of whom literature can boast. Having an insurmountable dislike to monastic and idle life, he very soon escaped from what he considered his prison, and went to Cologne and Frankfort on the Oder, where there were at the time two celebrated high schools, and where he devoted himself to the study of the Roman classical writers. Being cast off by his father on account of his escape from the Cloister-school of Fulda, he was reduced to great poverty ; which he endured with manly fortitude. His poverty is sufficiently indicated in the lines which he wrote during a severe illness at Padua, and which form, at present, his epitaph—an instructive comment on his firmness and high principle.

According to the will of his father he was to study law, and therefore went to Padua, and from thence to Bologna, where the pressure of external circumstances led him to enter the army of Maximilian, emperor of Germany, then at war with Venice. But Hutten soon left the military service, and being ill and without means, returned to Germany on foot, where he remained until 1514, when he returned to Italy, in order to continue his legal studies. He afterwards proceeded to Rome, and what he saw there, and the disgust he experienced at the corruption of the clergy, he described in biting epigrams and satires. To evade the persecutions which he had to endure in consequence, he returned to his native land, following the invitation of Albrecht, archbishop of Mayence. How he there laboured for the improvement of his countrymen and the suppression of vice, we need not dwell on, as it is beyond our range. In the year 1515, he returned, for the third time, to Italy, where his stay, however, was of very short duration. His insuperable aversion to all he saw, and the danger which he incurred in exposing Italian vice and clerical villainy, made him soon return to Germany.

Here he was knighted by the emperor Maximilian, as a reward for his chivalrous virtues ; and having been made poet-laureat, he was crowned at Augsburg (on which occasion, Constantia, the handsomest maiden of her age, and daughter of the celebrated historian, Conrad Pentinger, at whose house Hutten had met with a hospitable reception, made the garland of the choicest laurels), where he remained for some time. When Luther took the field against the pope, Hutten could not long remain inactive or undecided. He embraced the cause of the Reformer with all his might, and, although he still lived at the Court of Albrecht, he, nevertheless, thundered forth his destructive missives against the Church of Rome, the pope, and the clergy. He wrote against Leo X., and all those who were opposed to Luther, and produced a number of excellent works, both in Latin and German, in verse and prose, just as he felt prompted at the time. The result of all this was such as might have been expected. Leo X. was enraged, and commanded the archbishop to send Hutten to Rome. This demand was met by the rising generation with scorn and defiance ; but the good opinion of the archbishop had been greatly shaken, and Hutten could remain no longer at his court. The consequence was, that he now entered the list against Luther's adversaries with more acrimony than ever, and even offered to attack them at the point of his sword. The emperor Maximilian, his friend and protector, having died about this time, Hutten was excommunicated by the pope, and ere-long outlawed by Charles V., the successor of Maximilian, who, together with other German princes, was commanded by Leo X. to send Hutten to Rome. Without a home to shelter him, and exposed to the mercy of Italian assassins, who watched their opportunity, he took refuge at the castle of Ebernburg, the seat of his faithful friend, Franz von Sickingen. From this place he addressed letters to the emperor Charles V., Albrecht, archbishop of Mayence, and Frederick the Wise, elector of Saxony, in which he defended himself and demanded justice against the Court of Rome. He henceforth wrote in German against those whom he deemed the enemies of moral and civil freedom, the opponents of reason and sound judgment, and thus contributed greatly towards making the Germans favourable to the good cause. Had he confined himself to the enlightenment of the German nation on these things, the end of his career might have been vastly different. But it was otherwise determined. His friend and protector, Franz von Sickingen, having died, Germany was no longer a safe place of retreat, and Hutten fled to Ufnan, a small island in the lake of Zurich, in Switzerland, which became the resting-place of the weary and heavy-laden wanderer. His mortal frame succumbed to the repeated attacks of want and

misery in the thirty-sixth year of his age ; thus liberating a spirit which, had external circumstances been commensurate with his internal or mental powers, must have exercised vast influence, and given a new aspect to the state of things. Such is the general opinion of the best-informed minds of Germany.

Our limited space precludes us from dwelling on many other personages who were distinguished for the part they took in the Reformation ; and we shall therefore, in closing, merely inquire, and that very briefly, into the charges brought against it, and the results it produced on the literature, morals, and well-being of society.

Much has been said by the enemies of the Reformation in disparagement of Protestantism, and much that is in every respect untrue has been laid to its charge. Thus, we are told that the tendency of Protestantism is *to deny* ; and yet the Augsburg confession alone sufficiently proves how much, and to what a great extent, it *affirms*. Protestantism has been accused of having *caused a disruption in the unity of belief in Christendom* ; whereas it is an easy matter to prove from history, *that this so much boasted unity had been disturbed long before by the disputes which existed for centuries previous to the Reformation*, and that in the Romish Church, *in spite of the Inquisition*, and the like abominable tribunals, *there have been schisms in all ages, and are even at this present moment*. The very existence of these Inquisitions, what does it prove but the absence of the so much vaunted unity ? Some have endeavoured to represent the Reformation as a rebellion against the power of the pope and the emperor, and have accused it of having roused the spirit of rebellion. But these men forget one trifling circumstance, namely—that the source of all this was not the Reformation, but the knowledge of the *illegitimate character of the oppressive dominion of the Romish see*. The emperor of Germany, it should be remembered, was not the protector of the popes and their usurpations. It would be well for its accusers to pause ere they bring such charges against the Reformation, and to remember that a revolutionary spirit was created by the popes themselves, inasmuch as it was they who attempted, on various occasions, to dethrone emperors and kings—no less than sixty instances are on record—released the subjects from their oath of allegiance, and thus violated the dignity and safety of the throne. As for the revolutions which have taken place in modern days, it is but too well known that almost all of them occurred in Roman Catholic countries, as, for example, in France (not forgetting that of the 26th of February, 1848), Spain, Portugal, Belgium, Poland, Austria, Bavaria, &c. So far from acting as is alleged, the Reformation strengthened and gave stability to the thrones of temporal princes. Thereby monarchs were freed from

an arrogant and ignominious supremacy, and were enabled to receive into their dominions the confessors of other creeds, and to exercise tolerance towards their fellow-men.

Another charge brought against the Reformation, is its having split Germany into two parts, Roman Catholic and Protestant, and of having by this means weakened the country and promoted its dissolution. This is a gross mistake, and wholly untrue. We shall find no difficulty whatever in proving that the Reformation was the greatest blessing that could have been bestowed on Germany. Previous to it, Germany was feeble, and was rent asunder, because it had been an elective empire, and because the imperial power was weakened by the authorization of which the States were possessed. But, it was the dependence on the Roman see which proved more than all detrimental to Germany and its interests. The popes regarded the German empire as their fief, and the right of election by the electors as a privilege conferred by themselves. They claimed a right to examine into and reject the choice of emperors, and to induct the emperor and all princes. We have already stated that the greater and better part of Germany belonged to the Romish clergy. Over those lands of the church which consisted of three electorates, viz., Mayence, Trèves, and Cologne, the archbishopric Salzburg, the bishoprics of Passau, Freisingen, Eichstädt, Augsburg, Bamberg, Würzburg, Minden, Speier, Magdeburg, &c., and a great number of abbeys and monasteries, the protectorate only was conceded to the emperor, while they themselves contributed little or nothing towards the expenses incurred by the State. The proprietors of these lands obeyed the emperor in so far only as the pope would permit. In this manner the papal jurisdiction crossed in every direction that of the emperor and the other temporal princes; and the imposts exacted by Rome were so many, and of so monstrous a nature, that the temporal princes complained most bitterly of having no longer wherewith even to defend the empire and preserve public order. The whole of Germany, in fact, had become one immense province of the Romish see. The Reformation put an end to this state of things, and would have delivered the whole of Germany from papal dominion, had it not been for Austria—that European China—and Bavaria.

Alike beneficent were the results of the Reformation with regard to the self-dependence of civil society. Up to the period of the Reformation, the Romish see prescribed who was to be tolerated as a subject of the State, and who was not; what men were to think, believe, speak, and write; what and when they were to eat and work, and when not. The excommunication and anathema of the pope deprived a man of his honour and right, and dispensed even life and death. The priests and monks were independent of civil jurisdiction, and legislation concerning marriage was en-

tirely in the hands of the popes. The hosts of monks and nuns, and their wealthy monasteries contributed nothing towards the development and strengthening of civil life, and a vast amount of national property was withdrawn from trade and industry. All this was put a stop to by the Reformation. But this event became beneficial also, in as far as it brought the clergy back to their original calling, improved the religious instruction given in schools, abolished a host of superstitious ideas and unnecessary holidays, abrogated the inquisition, and rendered conspicuous the merit of practical Christianity in contradistinction from formal and ceremonial piety. Equally beneficial were its effects with regard to science. The single circumstance that the progress made in science, and the cultivation of it, no longer depended upon the suspicious control of the Inquisition, and that the human mind obtained full and unconditional liberty to inquire into every province of knowledge, without having to face the dungeon and funeral pile, was a gain of unspeakable importance. But, inasmuch as the Reformation had, and still has, to justify itself partly on Scriptural and partly on historical ground, it produced a most beneficial effect upon the success and blossoming of classical learning and archæology, free historical research, criticism, and philosophy, and imparted thereby also a fruitful impulse to inquiries into all other scientific truths.

ART. V.—*Chronicles and Characters of the Stock Exchange.* By John Francis. 8vo. Pp. 386. London: Willoughby and Co.

MR. FRANCIS'S 'History of the Bank of England' is one of the most readable books which has appeared for many years, and its rapid and extensive sale—a third edition having been issued—will attract a large class of purchasers to this volume. The plan of the work was happily conceived, and the information it contains, and the spirit with which it is executed, render it worthy of the success it has obtained. We are not surprised to find that the author has been encouraged to continue his labours. His doing so is a graceful acknowledgment of the public favour he has won, and we take an early opportunity of commending his second publication to our readers. The title of this volume is attractive. It meets the craving of the public mind, proffers

the kind of information which all classes are eager to obtain, and, while it promises to gratify curiosity, forms a central point round which are gathered materials that the philosopher and the economist may ponder on with advantage. There is a mysterious interest attaching to the Stock Exchange. Few families have escaped its influence. Some have been impoverished and others enriched by its transactions, while very few exercise other than a blind reliance on the integrity and knowledge of those who conduct its affairs. It is extremely rare to meet, even amongst intelligent men, with any tolerable knowledge of the principles on which its engagements are conducted, and yet its influence is all but universal. Tens of thousands are affected by it for weal or for woe, without any other knowledge than that it ministers to their wealth or empties their coffers. The monetary system is a vast enigma, which they are not able to solve, though their fortunes and their happiness are staked on its fluctuations. They see and feel its issues, but have no clear apprehension of its data. In proportion to this ignorance of principles, is the curiosity felt to learn something of the character and habits, the history and the procedure, of the men who are employed in its affairs. Innumerable traditions float around the public mind. It is of the nature of ignorance to invest the objects of its idolatry with mystery. The unknown is endowed with fictitious qualities, which are regarded as an augury of good or evil, according to the cheerful or the melancholy temperament of the devotee. The men of the monied interest have, consequently, in all ages, been viewed with emotions approaching to the superstitious—sometimes detested as evil deities, and at others, worshipped with a blind and unquestioning reverence. This state of things is now happily passing away. Light has penetrated into some of the recesses which were formerly shrouded in darkness, and, though great ignorance yet prevails, a glimmering of truth is beginning to be perceptible. Isaac of York has given place to the creditable broker of the nineteenth century; and the game of hazard played by the Jew merchant of the Middle Age, has been exchanged for a science whose principles are identical with those of general commerce. The old superstition yet lingers in some quarters. Relics of the faith of our fathers are occasionally met with; but they are extremely rare, and should be preserved in the cabinet of antiquarians. Turning from such mementos of the past, we gladly avail ourselves of the labours of Mr. Francis, which, without pretensions to statistical accuracy or to philosophical investigation, put us into easy possession of many interesting and important facts. The object of the work is thus stated by the author:—

‘ To gather the many remarkable incidents connected with the

National Debt ; to present an anecdotal sketch of the causes which necessitated, and the corruptions which increased it ; to reproduce its principal characters ; to detail the many evils of lotteries ; to relate the difficulties in the early history of railways ; to popularize those loans of which the Poyais with its melancholy tragedy, and the Greek with its whimsical transactions, were such striking exemplars ; and to group these subjects around the Stock Exchange, is the object of a portion of the present volume.

‘ Any work which tends to familiarize the origin and progress of the National Debt, which shows that it was raised for no idle cause, and increased for no trifling purpose, may be useful in the consideration of that encumbrance which must, sooner or later, be reduced or repudiated.

‘ The volume does not profess to be statistical—there are abundant works of a financial kind upon the subject. Mr. Van Sommer’s valuable tables, to which the writer acknowledges his obligations, and which, with Mr. Wilkinson’s “ Law of the Public Funds,” should be possessed by every member of the Stock Exchange ; the works of Mc Culloch, of Hamilton, of Grellier, of Fenn, render such a production unnecessary. The present volume is a popular narrative of the money-power of England, intended to be at once interesting and suggestive.’—*Preface.*

Our early kings, in common with those of Europe generally, had great difficulty in raising the monies required for their service, and no inconsiderable ingenuity was displayed in the modes to which they resorted. Many a monarch whom history has blazoned as a pattern of kingly virtues, shrivels down into meanness, and takes a place beside the cheat and the robber, when inquiry is pushed beyond the record of the venal historian. The worshippers of kings will do well to ponder the brief sketch of their nefarious deeds, which constitutes the early part of Mr. Francis’s first chapter. If they do not rise from its perusal disabused of their superstition, we abandon all hope of their conversion. Continuing his sketch to comparatively modern times, Mr. Francis tells us,—

‘ Charles I. seized the money of his merchants ; and his bonds were hawked about the streets, were offered to people as they left church, and sold to the highest bidder. The Commonwealth were debtors on the security of the forfeited estates. Charles II. took money from France, shut up the Exchequer, borrowed from his friends, and did anything rather than run the risk of being again sent on his travels. Thus, it would seem, the exchequer of the earlier monarchs was in the pockets of the people ; that of Henry VIII. in the suppressed monasteries ; Elizabeth in the corporations ; and Charles II. wherever he could find it.

‘ The abdication of James II., and the arrival of William III., form an era in the history of the monetary world. The plans adopted by the latter to crush the power of France, and raise the credit of England, were the commencement of that great accumulation known as the

National Debt, and the origin, though remote, of that building celebrated throughout Europe as the Stock Exchange. The rapid sketch now presented of the mode in which money was supplied, confirms the remark of Mr. Macaulay, that "there can be no greater error than to imagine the device of meeting the exigencies of the State by loans was imported into our island by William III. From a period of immemorial antiquity, it had been the practice of every English government to contract debts. What the revolution introduced was, the practice of honestly paying them." —P. 9, 10.

The Tulip mania in Holland, in 1634, constitutes the earliest instance of that fatal love of speculation of which we have recently witnessed such lamentable effects. Most of our readers probably are familiar with its history. The ordinary pursuits of commerce were for a time abandoned, and visions of a golden era sported before the unimaginative minds of the Dutch merchant and artizan. Tulips were as eagerly sought in 1634, as railway scrip in 1844; nor was the passion more unreasonable or absurd. 'Bargains were made for the delivery of certain roots; and when, as in one case, there were but two in the market, lordship and land, horses and oxen, were sold to pay the deficiency. Contracts were made, and thousands of florins paid for tulips, which were never seen by broker, by lawyer, or by seller.' People of all professions felt the mania, and, for a time, fortunes were made. The tide, however, soon turned, the bubble burst, and, as in our day, thousands were ruined. So it was in Holland in 1634, and so it has unhappily been at different periods in our own country. A few fortunate speculators are enriched; but the habits and morals of the community receive a shock from which they do not recover for many years. It is well occasionally to glance at such ruinous follies in order that we may be guarded against their recurrence.

Dealers in the funds were for a long period a very unpopular class, and we do not much wonder at it. They took the place of the Jew money-dealer, and, whether justly or not, were supposed to inherit all his bad qualities. Moreover, their craft was misapprehended, and the gambling which unquestionably was mixed up with it, excited odium, and directed against them the antipathy of the more sober and industrious part of the nation. 'They can ruin men silently,' says a contemporary, 'undermine and impoverish, fiddle them out of their money, by the strange, unheard-of engines of interest, discount, transfers, tallies, debentures, shares, projects, and the devil and all of figures and hard names.' Prior to 1698, they assembled in the Royal Exchange; but their presence there being objected to, they removed to a then unoccupied space in Change Alley, and Jonathan's Coffee-house became the scene of their regular attendance. Sir Henry

Furnese, a director of the Bank of England, was one of the most successful jobbers of his day. His couriers conveyed to him the earliest intelligence from Holland, Flanders, France, and Germany, and the temptation to deceive was sometimes too powerful for his honesty.

‘ He fabricated news ; he insinuated false intelligence ; he was the originator of some of those plans which at a later period were managed with so much effect by Rothschild. If Sir Henry wished to buy, his brokers were ordered to look gloomy and mysterious, hint at important news, and after a time sell. His movements were closely watched ; the contagion would spread ; the speculators grew alarmed ; prices be lowered 4 or 5 per cent.—for in those days the loss of a battle might be the loss of a crown—and Sir Henry Furnese would reap the benefit by employing different brokers to purchase as much as possible at the reduced price. Large profits were thus made ; but a demoralizing spirit was spread throughout the Stock Exchange. Bankrupts and beggars sought the same pleasure in which the millionaire indulged, and often with similar success.’—P. 29.

The great Marlborough was accompanied through his campaigns by Medina, a wealthy Jew, who repaid himself for an annuity of six thousand pounds to the former, by the early intelligence he forwarded to his own agents in Change Alley. The first foreign loan was negotiated in 1706, when the victories of Marlborough had raised the pride of England to its highest pitch, and disposed all classes of the community readily to adopt his counsel. The precedent has been far from uninfluential, till at length the wealth of the English capitalist has become one of the most important elements of European policy. The first political hoax on record occurred about the same time.

‘ Down the Queen’s-road, riding at a furious rate, ordering turnpikes to be thrown open, and loudly proclaiming the sudden death of the queen, rode a well-dressed man, sparing neither spur nor steed. From west to east, and from north to south, the news spread. Like wildfire it passed through the desolate fields where palaces now abound, till it reached the city. The train bands desisted from their exercise, furled their colours, and returned home with their arms reversed. The funds fell with a suddenness which marked the importance of the intelligence ; and it was remarked that, while the Christian jobbers stood aloof, almost paralyzed with the information, Manasseh Lopez and the Jew interest bought eagerly at the reduced price. There is no positive information to fix the deception upon any one in particular, but suspicion was pointed at those who gained by the fraud so publicly perpetrated.’—P. 47.

In 1772 the trading interests of the country suffered a terrible shock from over speculation, in which the Scotch bankers were largely implicated. Mr. Fordyce, of the firm of Neale, Fordyce,

and Co., had been one of the most adventurous and successful speculators in the English market, and he became, on the turn of the tide, an easy victim of his uncontrolled cupidity. 'He broke,' says Mr. Francis, 'half the people in town. Glyn and Hallifax were gazetted as bankrupts; Drummonds were only saved by General Smith, a Nabob—the original of Foote's Sir Matthew Mite—supporting their house with £150,000.' The extent of the injury inflicted will be no matter of surprise, when it is known that Mr. Fordyce had in circulation bills to the amount of four millions. Amongst those to whom he applied for assistance, was a shrewd Quaker, who jocularly replied, 'Friend Fordyce, I have known many men ruined by two dice, but I will not be ruined by Four-dice.'

The following is a characteristic anecdote of one of the most worthless public men known to our history, whom the folly of his opponents raised for a time to public favour:—

'In 1774, the number of Hebrew brokers was limited to twelve; and the privilege was always purchased by a liberal gratuity to the lord mayor. During this year, the mayoralty of Wilkes, one of the privileged being at the point of death, Wilkes, with characteristic boldness, openly calculated on the advantage to be attained, and was very particular in his inquiries after the sick man. The rumour that Wilkes had openly expressed a wish for the death of the Hebrew was spread by the wags of 'Change Alley, and the son of the broker sought his lordship to reproach him with his cupidity. "My dear fellow," replied Wilkes, with the readiness peculiar to him, "you are greatly in error. I would sooner have seen all the Jew-brokers dead than your father."'

—P. 113.

The corruption of public men at this period was beyond all conception. The national resources were dealt with on the lowest principles of the worst class of jobbers, and the nation, in consequence, suffered terribly. The worshippers of 'the good old times,' would do well to study this part of our history. Ministers of the crown, and their senatorial supporters, made no scruple of enriching themselves at the cost of the nation, and our representative system, as it then existed, enabled them to do so with impunity. A tithe of the misdeeds openly perpetrated would now drive any public man from the councils of the Sovereign, and prevent his being received in any respectable society. In 1778, a loan was proposed, for which the usual applications were made. Political events then wore a threatening appearance, and the answers of the Exchequer being detained much beyond the usual time, the applicants became very anxious. When it was clearly ascertained that the funds must fall, and that the scrip would therefore be at a discount, the course of the Exchequer was determined, and the whole loan 'was divided

amongst those who were either without interest, or were opposed to the Government.' In 1781, on the contrary, when a new loan was proposed, the same houses applied, but the scrip being at a premium they were overlooked, and the loan was divided amongst the adherents of the ministry. 'Prior to the allotment, one firm was waited on by a stranger, and told that, if they would add his name to their list, they would be favourably considered. The house declined the proposal, and sent in a tender for two millions; when to their surprise they received, with an allotment of £560,000, an intimation that the odd £60,000 was for the gentleman who had waited on them, and of whom they knew nothing.' It is curious to notice the increase in the number of applicants for these loans. In 1778, they were only 240; in 1779, they had grown to 600; in 1780, to 1100; and, in 1781, they reached 1600.

The subject of lotteries, the application of which to State-purposes originated at Genoa, is treated very fully by our author, in his eighth chapter, and we fully agree in the opinion he expresses on their demoralizing and ruinous tendency.

'The eagerness of the populace grew with the opportunity. The newspapers teemed with proposals; and the rage for gambling reigned uncontrolled. Every ravenous adventurer who could collect a few articles advertised a lottery. Shopkeepers, compelled by the decrease of business, took the hint, and disposed of their goods in lottery. Ordinary business among the lower tradesmen was greatly suspended. Purchasers refused to give the full price for that which might be obtained for nothing. Large profits were procured upon worthless articles; and, in 1709, so great was the eagerness to subscribe to a state-lottery, that Mercers' Hall was literally crowded with customers, and the clerks were insufficient to record the influx of names. It was, however, from those which were termed "little-goes"—which drew the last penny from the pockets of the poor man—which saw the father gambling and the daughter starving, the mother purchasing tickets and the child crying for bread—that most evil arose. The magistracy, not always the first to interfere, grew alarmed, and announced their determination to put in practice the penalties which, if earlier enforced, would have been beneficial, but, unhappily, were incompetent to put down that which they might easily have prevented. It was found also impossible to restrain in private adventurers the wrong that the State sanctioned in public.

'It was known that lotteries were injurious to morals and to manners; it was known that crime followed in their wake; it was known that misery and misfortune were their attendants—but the knowledge was vain, and remonstrance useless, under the plea of the necessities of the State.'—Pp. 127, 128.

The wars of the French revolution added greatly to our national burdens, by the absurd system, then adopted, of subsi-

dising the states of Europe. The policy pursued by our rulers evinced a reckless disregard of the future in order to meet the apparent necessities of the day. The governments of Europe assumed the attitude and importunity of beggars, and England prodigally met their demands. William Pitt was a befitting minister for George III. The minister was as unscrupulous as the monarch was obstinate, and the wealth of England was lavished as freely as her blood was spilt. The following list of subsidies up to 1801, will give some idea of the ruinous manner in which her resources were scattered :—

Prussia	1794	£1,223,891	10	6
Sardinia, 1793 to 1796		500,000	0	0
Emperor, 1795 and 1796		6,220,000	0	0
Ditto	1797	700,000	0	0
Portugal	1797	247,205	0	0
Ditto	1798	120,013	13	0
Russia	1799	825,000	0	0
Emperor and Elector of Bavaria		500,000	0	0
Emperor		1,066,666	13	4
Russia		545,494	0	0
Bavaria		501,017	6	0
Emperor		150,000	0	0
		£12,599,288	2	10

—P. 117.

We have not yet seen the end of this policy. The vast debt it has entailed presses with ever-augmenting weight on our national energies, and we tremble to think of the possibilities of the future. It is a notorious and alarming evil, with which our statesmen are yet content to tamper, but who shall say what the exigencies of coming generations will prompt? May our rulers have wisdom to avert the calamities with which the madness of William Pitt threatens the nation!

Mark Sprot, one of the greatest capitalists of the day, died in 1808, and at the Stock Exchange his name is still associated with many pleasant memories. 'I never do business with privileged persons,' was his shrewd and daring reply, when asked before a parliamentary committee, during Lord Melville's trial, whether he did not act as banker to members of both houses. The following anecdote illustrates the same intrepidity and firmness :—

'On one occasion a broker applied to Mark Sprot, and with great sorrow told him that he was a ruined man. Mr. Sprot was surprised, for he knew the speaker was careful, industrious, and not likely to speculate. He asked the cause, and the broker replied that he had been employed largely by a principal, who, the prices having gone

against him, had refused to pay his losses. Mr. Sprot immediately inquired his name ; and on his being told that it was a noble earl, of whose resources he was well aware, could scarcely believe he heard correctly.

‘ He knew him to be in possession of large landed estates ; and, when informed that his lordship had refused to give any reason except that it was not convenient, Mr. Sprot told his visitor not to be alarmed, that he would not press his claim, and concluded by making an engagement with him to visit his lordship.

‘ Together they went, and were received with patrician dignity. Mr. Sprot deliberately detailed his business, and received the cool reply that it was not convenient to pay. But the energetic jobber was not a man to bow before rank, unless accompanied by worth ; and Mr. Sprot unhesitatingly declared that if the account were not settled by a certain hour next day, he would post his lordship as a defaulter. The latter grew alarmed, and attempted to conciliate ; but the conference closed with the repeated determination of Mr. Sprot to post him. Long before the hour appointed, however, his lordship’s solicitor waited on the broker to arrange the payment ; and thus the honour of the earl was preserved, and the credit of the broker saved in the money-market, through the acuteness and determination of Mark Sprot.’—Pp. 202, 203.

The name of David Ricardo is known throughout a much wider circle, and the following brief notice of his career does him simple justice. His father was a Jew who introduced his son, at the early age of fourteen, to the mysteries of the Stock Exchange. The latter was of an inquiring and philosophical cast of mind, and, what is still better, was ready honestly to follow out his convictions. The result was an abandonment of the faith of his fathers, and his being in consequence cast on his own resources.

‘ Those resources were small ; but his conduct and character had interested the members of Capel Court, and, to their honour, with a liberality which not unfrequently distinguishes them, the oldest and most influential came to his assistance. The extraordinary powers of Mr. Ricardo were soon developed in the acquisition of a considerable fortune ; and, having hitherto employed but little time in study, he amply and nobly redeemed his lost hours. At twenty-five he commenced mathematics, and with great application studied chemistry and mineralogy, fitted up a laboratory, formed a collection of minerals, and bestirred himself with all the energy of his character. These sciences, however, he soon abandoned ; and, having accidentally become acquainted with Adam Smith’s “ Wealth of Nations,” he employed his great thought upon the subject of political economy, in which he soon became distinguished. He led the van in the bullion controversy—his principles were those on which the present Bank charter is founded ; and, in 1817, he published that great work on his favourite science so familiar to the commercial reader.

‘His reputation preceded him to the senate ; and his opinions on the above subjects were deferred to with respect. When Mr. Peel’s bill was introduced, in 1819, his name was called for from all sides of the House ; and, in 1823, David Ricardo, an acute, patient, and comprehensive thinker, a firm and faithful friend, and an honour to the body of which he was a member, died, at the early age of fifty-two.’—Pp. 209, 210.

Mr. Francis goes very needlessly out of his way to disparage the ‘Financial Reform Association.’ His remarks on this point want the good sense and candour which are usually observable in his writings, and his conclusion limps most miserably. The logic of his reasoning, if it may be termed such, is neither more nor less than this,—that because the Association cannot do everything, it should do nothing ; that because a debt exists, the interest of which amounts to twenty-eight millions annually, it is, therefore ‘absolutely idle’ to think of lowering taxation by abolishing sinecures, reducing the national forces, and extending a rigid but just economy through all departments of the state. We should deem it an insult to the understanding of our readers to attempt a serious refutation of such statements. They carry with them their own correction,—the common sense of every man rendering it obvious, that in proportion to such a burden is the necessity of revising, with the utmost possible economy, our public expenditure. The insinuation thrown out respecting ‘repudiation’ is unworthy of the author, and will be suppressed, we hope, in a future edition. As it now stands, it is more damaging to his own reputation than to that of the Association.

The name of Thomas Gray is probably unknown to many of our readers, who are in the daily habit of indulging in the luxury to which his genius so powerfully contributed. The ingratitude of the public to its benefactors has rarely been more signally exhibited than in his case.

‘From an early period he formed the opinion that railways would become the principal mode of transit. It was his thought by day ; it was his dream by night. He talked of it until his friends voted him an intolerable bore. He wrote of it until the reviewers deemed him mad. Coaches, canals, and steam boats were, in his mind, useless. His wisdom and far ken shadowed forth the path which the purse of others consummated ; and while the projector died steeped to the lips in poverty, the speculators realized great profits. His conversation was of a world which his companions could not comprehend. To appropriate the idea of Mr. Macaulay, there were fools then as there are fools now ; fools who laughed at the railway as they had laughed at the canals ; fools who thought they evinced their wisdom by doubting what they could not understand. For years his mind was absorbed by these dreams ; and there was something magnificent in all his projects.

He talked of enormous fortunes realized ; of coaches annihilated ; of one great general line,—and he was laughed at. He went to Brussels ; and when a canal was proposed, he again advocated railways. At last he put his thoughts into form ; wrote “Observations on a railroad for the whole of Europe ;” and was ridiculed ; the work being suppressed, lest men should call him mad. In 1820, however, he published a book which he called, “A general iron railway, or land steam conveyance,” which attracted great notice. There was something so pertinacious in the man, and something so simple in his scheme, that, though it became the custom to laugh at him, his book went through many editions. When from Belgium he came to England, true to his theme, he went among the Manchester capitalists. The men who passed their lives among, and owed their fortunes to, the marvels of machinery, were not yet equal to this. They listened graciously, and with a smile, something akin to pity, dismissed him as an incorrigible visionary. But opposition was vain ; nor was Thomas Gray the man to be easily laughed down. He continued his labours, he continued to talk, to memorialize, to petition, to fill the pages of magazines, until the public mind was wearied and worried.—Pp. 249, 250.

In 1820, Thomas Gray published a practical plan which, in 1830, was made a great fact by Mr. Stephenson, yet, we regret to say that, as the projector was poor and friendless, he derived no benefit from the national boon which his genius conferred. ‘ Neglected by the directors of the great works he had pioneered into existence ; neglected by the State, whose profits from railway stamps and railway duties are mainly owing to him ; neglected by the great mass of men, who avail themselves of the conveyance which once they derided ; the “railway pioneer,” that title which to the last he so dearly loved, died steeped to the lips in poverty, while the speculators reaped large gains.’

The following notice of the elder Rothschild—father of the member for London—will be acceptable to all who are interested in contemporaneous biography. His life has a moral which men may profitably study, and the great lesson it inculcates is the vanity of mere wealth. ‘ You must be a happy man, Mr. Rothschild,’ said a gentleman on one occasion, when partaking of his hospitality, and was met by the startling reply, ‘ Happy!—me happy! What! happy when, just as you are going to dine, you have a letter placed in your hands, saying, “If you do not send me £500 I will blow your brains out?” Happy!—me happy!’ Let the happiness of the envied millionaire be estimated from the fact that he frequently slept with loaded pistols by his side. But to the sketch :—

‘ The name of Rothschild as contractor for an English loan made its first public appearance in 1819. But the twelve millions for which he then became responsible went to a discount ; it was said, however, that Mr. Rothschild had relieved himself from all liability before the

calamity could reach him. From this year his transactions pervaded the entire globe. The old and the new world alike bore witness to his skill; and with the profits on a single loan he purchased an estate which cost £150,000. Minor capitalists, like parasitical plants, clung to him, and were always ready to advance their money in speculations at his bidding. Nothing seemed too gigantic for his grasp; nothing too minute for his notice. His mind was as capable of contracting a loan for millions, as of calculating the lowest possible amount on which a clerk could exist. Like too many great merchants whose profits were counted by thousands, he paid his assistants the smallest amount for which he could procure them. He became the high priest of the temple of Janus, and the coupons raised by the capitalist for a despotic state were more than a match for the cannon of the revolutionist. From most of the speculations of 1824 and 1825 Mr. Rothschild kept wisely aloof. The Alliance Life and Fire Assurance Company, which owes its origin to this period, was, however, produced under his auspices; and its great success is a proof of his forethought. None of the loans with which he was connected were ever repudiated, and when the crash of that sad period came, the great Hebrew looked coolly and calmly on, and congratulated himself on his caution. At his counting-house a fair price might be procured for any amount of stock which, at a critical time, would have depressed the public market; and it was no uncommon circumstance for brokers to apply at the office of Mr. Rothschild, instead of going in the Stock Exchange.

‘He was, however, occasionally surpassed in cunning, and, on one occasion, a great banker lent Rothschild a million and a-half on the security of consols, the price of which was then 84. The terms on which the money was lent were simple. If the price reached 74, the banker might claim the stock at 70; but Rothschild felt satisfied that, with so large a sum out of the market, the bargain was tolerably safe. The banker, however, as much a Jew as Rothschild, had a plan of his own. He immediately began selling the consols received from the latter, together with a similar amount in his own possession. The funds dropped; the Stock Exchange grew alarmed; other circumstances tended to depress it; the fatal price of 74 was reached; and the Christian banker had the satisfaction of outwitting the Hebrew loan-monger.

‘But, if sometimes outwitted himself, there is little doubt he made others pay for it, and, on one occasion, it is reported, that his finesse proved too great for the authorities of the Bank of England. Mr. Rothschild was in want of bullion, and went to the governor to procure on loan a portion of the superfluous store. His wishes were met; the terms were agreed on; the period was named for its return; and the affair finished for a time. The gold was used by the financier, his end was answered, and the day arrived on which he was to return the borrowed metal. Punctual to the time appointed, Mr. Rothschild entered; and those who remember his personal appearance may imagine the cunning twinkle of his small, quick eye, as, ushered into the presence of the governor, he handed the borrowed amount in bank notes. He was reminded of his agreement, and the necessity for bullion was urged. His reply was worthy a commercial Talleyrand,—“Very well, gentlemen,

Give me the notes ! I dare say your cashier will honour them with gold from your vaults, and then I can return you bullion." To such a speech the only worthy reply was a scornful silence.

'One cause of his success was the secrecy with which he shrouded all his transactions, and the tortuous policy with which he misled those the most who watched him the keenest. If he possessed news calculated to make the funds rise, he would commission the broker who acted on his behalf to sell half a million. The shoal of men who usually follow the movements of others sold with him. The news soon passed through Capel Court that Rothschild was bearing the market, and the funds fell. Men looked doubtfully at one another ; a general panic spread ; bad news was looked for ; and these united agencies sunk the price two or three per cent. This was the result expected ; and other brokers, not usually employed by him, bought all they could at the reduced rate. By the time this was accomplished, the good news had arrived ; the pressure ceased ; the funds rose instantly ; and Mr. Rothschild reaped his reward.'—Pp. 300—304.

Mr. Francis closes his account of the Stock Exchange at the panic of 1835. To have continued it to the present day would have brought him into collision with living men, and he has, therefore, prudently at least, left this part of the narrative to be supplied by some future historians. His last chapter—the eighteenth—is devoted to a hasty glance at the rise and developments of Life Assurance Companies, than which scarcely any topic is fraught with greater social importance. On the formation of the Amicable, in 1706, the highest authorities were prejudiced against the system, while the public generally regarded it as a species of gambling which involved special profanity. The excellence of the principle, however, triumphed over all misconception and hostility. Eight other companies were formed in the course of the following century ; and from 1806 to 1846, upwards of a hundred were added to the list. As a general rule, better faith has been kept with the public by Assurance Companies, than by any other class of joint-stock associations. Only a few instances of defalcation have occurred, and even these have served to show the absolute security of the public if ordinary prudence only is observed. The most notable instance of dishonesty was the 'Independent West Middlesex,' formed about 1837, which was ably exposed by Mr. Mackenzie, of the 'Scotch Reformers' Gazette.' No terms are too strong to express the villany of this scheme, which spread ruin amongst thousands, and consigned to the poor-house and the gaol large numbers of thrifty, but credulous men. We are not, even now, without our misgivings, and we should be unfaithful journalists if we did not avow them. The additions daily made to the number of Assurance Companies awaken our apprehensions, and these are powerfully confirmed by a parliamentary document just issued.

By the 7th and 8th Vict. c. 110, it is directed that each new company shall furnish a copy of its financial statement to the Government. These returns have been printed by order of the House of Commons, and the document is dated 8th May, 1849.

After an attentive examination of this paper, we feel no hesitation in saying that some of the companies whose returns are furnished, are absolutely insolvent, and that others are only sustained on the hope of contingencies which are wholly incompatible with the idea of security. A more miserable exhibition than these accounts furnish cannot well be imagined, and we tremble in anticipation of the social misery which must follow. We cannot at present pursue the theme, and merely point attention to it as a means of inducing caution. Where absolute security is sought, no secondary consideration should be allowed to determine the choice of an office. As well may the hard earnings of industry be entrusted to the bankrupt or the gambler, as to some of the companies which are now soliciting public confidence.

In closing our notice of this volume, we tender our best thanks to Mr. Francis for the pleasure its perusal has given us. Its pages display a wide range of information, grouped together with vivacity and much graphic effect. The attractiveness of the novel is combined with the more enduring interest of matters of fact; and we know of no one, young or old, financier, politician, or lover of history, who will not pursue its narratives to the close. We should have been glad if it had consisted with the author's plan occasionally to point his moral; the permanent value of his labours would, in such case, have been enhanced. But, cynical as critics are deemed, we waive this requirement, and acknowledge with gratitude the service he has rendered. Where so much has been executed ably, it would be worse than captious to dwell on such an omission.

ART. VI.—*System of Christian Doctrine.* By Dr. Carl Immanuel Nitzsch. Translated from the Fifth German Edition, by Rev. Robert Montgomery, M.A., and John Hennen, M.D. Edinburgh: Clark.

ALL theological students who have any acquaintance with German literature, know the value of Nitzsch's writings. He occupies a foremost place, and well deserves it. Our present purpose, however, is not to enter on an examination of the author's opinions, nor to point out the merits of his 'System of Christian Doctrine,' but to deal with his translators. We rejoiced to see that this work was to appear in an English dress, under Messrs. Clark's auspices, from whose well-earned reputation we had a right to expect at least an accurate, and somewhat scholar-like version, but we have been miserably disappointed. Having been so, we think it may be worth while to put our readers, whose studies lie in this direction, on their guard, by apprizing them what sort of thing this volume is. We say, then, without hesitation, that the translators have shown an entire want of every qualification for their task. They have committed blunders which prove their ignorance of the simplest laws of German construction. They have no mastery over their own language, so as to express the thoughts which they have correctly apprehended in the original. They seem to know next to nothing of the peculiar nomenclature of the philosophical schools, whose opinions are often referred to. They give no signs of having any correct notion of the theological questions discussed, or their author's position in regard to them. They are guiltless of any, the slightest tincture, of acquaintance with at least one, if not both the languages in which the Scriptures are given; and with all these deficiencies they venture on the translation of one of the most German of German theologians, whose style, as they say in their preface, presents almost invincible difficulties. Amiable self-knowledge! We do not know what parts the two translators have respectively done; or whether the work has been performed by the Doctor, and the name of the clergyman given godfather fashion,—but it does not matter for our purpose. If there have been two gentlemen at work on it, we can only say that they exhibit a remarkable parity of unfitness, and that there is *no* difference 'twixt tweedledum and tweedledee.' And now for proofs of the correctness of our estimate. We shall not have far to go—one page of the preface (p. 7), furnishes us with the following to begin with:—

'I have sought to continue the dogmatic tendency of the work, which I have *felt advisable* to maintain since its last appearance in 1839.' This is certainly an extraordinary rendering of their author. The original says nothing about maintaining a tendency, but it says, 'I have endeavoured to continue the reply, which the book owes to the doctrinal movement in progress since its last appearance, 1839.' So that he does not maintain a tendency, but takes notice of, and replies to, a movement; he has not done this since 1839, but the movement has been going on since then; and all he means to say is, that he has tried to bring this new edition, as was due to his readers, up to the present state of opinion; all which our duumvirate has not seen. The next sentence is, according to our translators, 'Those authors with whom I differ in the main, I have endeavoured on every occasion to treat with courtesy.' Nitzsch says, 'Those authors with whom in the main I labour in concert (mit denen ich in der Hauptsache gleiches anstrebe), I have,' &c. Half a dozen lines down, 'Einleitung,' which every child knows means 'introduction,' in the present case referring to the introductory chapters of his book, is translated 'tendency,' and nonsense made accordingly.

On the same page, 'Am liebsten hätte ich mich . . . in voll kommenere Gemeinschaft gesetzt,' *i.e.* 'Most gladly would I have placed myself in more complete accordance,' &c.; which becomes, in this version, not a wish and a reason subjoined why it was impossible, but a statement of a fact, 'I am desirous,' &c. Now this is said by the author with regard to one school of opinion to which he thus gives a qualified adhesion; our translators make it a profession of his entire accordance. We said they did not know whereabouts on the map of opinion Nitzsch stands.

The next page gives us, 'To me the connexion between faith and natural science is nothing less than indifferent,' which from the context clearly means, 'anything rather than indifferent; still, however (aber dennoch), the blessing of revelation is independent thereof.'

'To me this relation, &c., is a matter of indifference, *for*,' &c. (p. 8, Montgomery). A boy at school that translated the disjunction 'aber' as an illative 'for,' and to support it made nonsense of the previous clause, would be whipped; and what do M.A.'s of Oxon and M.D.'s deserve?

A long sentence is then omitted, which we suppose is done on the principle of an old schoolmaster, with whom our youth used to be amused, who, when any word of portentous length occurred, was wont to say, 'Kitly words (*i.e.* ticklish) pass over,' and so saved his reputation. It unfortunately happens that this omitted sentence introduces an individual who, in the next

paragraph, devoted to the same subject, and *retained* in the translation, is sneered at by Nitzsch as a sort of compound of all opinions, which are united, he says, 'in einem und demselben Kritiker,' 'in one and the same critic,' which in this translation is rendered 'in one and the same *criticism*' (p. 8), a feminine noun, whereas the adjectives are both in the masculine; from which it is not a very hard inference that neither Mr. Montgomery nor Dr. Hennen can decline the German article.

These are some, by no means all, of the errors that two pages of a simple preface present. What shall we find when we get into the obscurities of the book itself? If our readers have courage we will try—only honestly premising that if they go further they must be content to fare worse.

We pass over a few pages, not because they are free from blunders; that is a characteristic belonging to no single page that we have seen. On pages 3 and 4, we find the first instances of what is fatal in such a work—namely, an unnecessary, arbitrary variation in the rendering of terms which are used with the strictest philosophical accuracy. We have innumerable instances of this. 'Erkennen,' cognition, is sometimes conception, sometimes perception—two very different things surely; sometimes knowledge—and this, as it would seem, with perfect disregard of context. We shall have other instances of the same sort to point out, but the one that we encounter here is as good as any. Nitzsch is treating of the relation which a system of Christian doctrine bears to 'Dogmatik' and 'Ethik' (which is mis-translated *Dogma* and *Ethics*), and he points out that it seeks to unite them—a thing, he says, which is eminently necessary, inasmuch as sometimes the 'Ethik' forgets its dependence 'von der Glaubenslehre,' upon the doctrine of faith—and sometimes, on the other hand, 'Dogmatik' loses sight of its relation 'auf die Sittenlehre,' to the doctrine of morals. Now if our translators had had on their shelves no more uncommon book than 'Kitto's Cyclopædia,' they might have seen there,* that 'in recent times, especially on the part of some German Protestant writers, a division of theological study' has often been called Dogmatics, or doctrines of faith; from which they might have inferred that 'Dogmatik' and 'Glaubenslehre' being one and the same thing, 'Ethik' and 'Sittenlehre' were also used as synonymous. If they had not understood this, they might at least have seen that these two words were formed on the same plan, and that the 'doctrine' held the same place in each. But no, they translate, 'Ethics forget their dependence upon doctrinal

*Preface, p. xiv.

faith (Glaubenslehre), and dogma its relation to *moral doctrine* (Sittenlehre); and by way of showing us the meaning more clearly, they put the two in italics. With praiseworthy impartiality, however, they give us, in the course of four pages, the following variations:—the doctrine of faith, doctrinal faith, for the one; and doctrine of morals, moral doctrine, morality, for the others—these three latter occurring in as many consecutive lines. We should be sorry to judge uncharitably, but we much suspect it is on the old principle, ‘Which is the French?’—‘Whichever you please—you pay your money, and you take your choice;’ so the translators having no clear idea of what was meant, benevolently give us a variety of meanings to select from.

In section 6, we find the following proof of our translators’ classical knowledge. ‘The word religion,’ says Nitzsch, ‘has been derived from *religare*, or from *religere*, but he thinks it certain that the only correct etymology is the latter, “*relegere, religere*, to read again, to observe.”’ With marvellous ingenuity at finding opportunities for blunder, the translation tells us that ‘the word is only derived from *religere, religare*,’—i.e., they take the two derivations and put them together as if they were one, showing at once their knowledge of Latin and of what their author was talking about.

This same section gives us some further insight into the philosophical acumen of the translators. Its subject is the idea (Begriff) of religion, and after enumerating several definitions, the author goes on to say, that whoever is dissatisfied with the objective ‘dependence on God,’ may, with Schleiermacher, exchange this, the objective, for the subjective, ‘consciousness of absolute dependence.’ Our translators say, ‘may substitute, with Schleiermacher, the objective for the subjective, “consciousness of absolute dependence,”’ an entire inversion of the meaning—making the great man referred to substitute something else unmentioned for his own well-known definition of religion. No person who read the German with the slightest attention could make such a mistake, nor any one who had any adequate knowledge of the matter under discussion. On the next page, ‘According to Hegel and Vatke, religion is a process of the mind; in which case it clearly appears that subjectivity can be only that which is transitory in the idea in question—the idea of religion, that is, (das Verschwindende am fraglichen Begriffe.)’ The translation says, that if religion be a process of the spirit, ‘subjectivity can only be an evanishing of the idea under discussion.’—(P. 9.) Can any one tell what this means? We may safely conjecture that the ‘evanishing of the idea’ in the translator’s mind was an event very near at hand, if it had not indeed already happened.

Page 10 gives us an instance of a frequently recurring error,

which justifies us in saying that the person who commits it is ignorant of the commonest usages of German. Every one knows that in a subjoined clause, the verb which in the original is in the subjunctive form, must be rendered in English by the indicative; but here it is uniformly rendered by *may* do, or be so and so; for instance, 'we assert that man *may* be raised up to a knowledge of God by such and such means (*erzogen werde*),' instead of 'is raised.' And again, 'it follows *inevitably* that man's inert persistence *may* lead!—(P. 31.) 'The ancients overlooked the fact that superstition *may* originally spring from unbelief,' &c. &c.

We pass over many gross blunders in the three following pages to come to page 13, (note 2,) where, after pointing out various authors who have advocated the immediate existence of religion in man's self-consciousness, Nitzsch goes on to say that of Kant it might seem as if he took (*könnte es scheinen als nehme er*) no part in this progress of opinion; and of Hegel, *as if he taught to despise it* (*als lehre er ihn verachten*), which is travestied thus:—'Since he treated the doctrine with contempt.' Nitzsch then shows that still Hegel, 'although he required a mediating process, in order that the true nature of the subject should reach the consciousness (*zum Bewusstsein komme*, which is mistranslated, should reach the conscience!) still, naturally, in opposition to simple empiricism or reflection (as the source of religion that is) so far treats fairly immediate knowledge in the form of faith, feeling, &c., that'—and so on. These last lines are thus twisted, 'naturally does justice to mere experience or reflection in the form of faith, of feeling, &c., as opposed to immediate knowledge,' in which two lines there are these monstrous blunders,—1. Hegel is represented as elevating experience and reflection to their right place, when it is intended to say that they were set aside, and in opposition to them (*der blossen Empirie oder Reflexion gegenuber*—every grammar would have told the translator that this preposition always comes after the nouns it governs) something else, viz., immediate knowledge, done justice to.—2. That the exegetical clause is misplaced, so as to make faith and feeling a form of reflection; whereas it stands in the German as plain as parentheses can make it, a further explanation of immediate knowledge—as indeed anybody who reflected on the matter for a moment would see it must be.

This same section gives us a very absurd blunder, which we must just notice. Nitzsch gets into a controversy with some anonymous writer, who maintains that 'all of which we are immediately certain, is our finiteness and God's existence (*Dasein*); that all knowledge of the mode of God's existence (*vom Sosein Gottes*) is only apparent knowledge, &c.; to which he replies in

ridicule, 'Gleichals ob das *er ist* ohne alle Gewissheit über wer, wie, was irgend Bedeutung hätte'—'Just as if the (statement) *he is*, without any certainty as to who, how, what (is), could have any meaning,'—a plain enough reply one would think to the opponent who said God's being is all we know; any question on the mode (the how, who, what,) is beyond us. But the translation, with beautiful confusion, twists it all round, and says, 'Just as if the who, which, what? (he is uncertain on the point) could have any meaning,'—which it certainly has not.

On page 21, we find the following quotation (p. 20 of the German): 'The true form of the *original* appearance of religion is only (seen), if it advances uniformly (or proportionately, *gleichmäsig*), in the totality of the men, penetrates knowledge and desire in the same proportion as it does feeling,' (in the same proportion as feeling does, say the translators!) But, says Nitzsch, people only speak of *an original*, when they have also to do with *a derived*, (einem Ursprunglichen—einem Abgeleiteten); an objection, that is, to the sentiment of the quotation which is thus represented in the translation, 'Origination has only been discussed, when at the same time derivation ought also to have been considered' (wenn man es zugleich . . zu thun hat).

In the same section, and the following, which are devoted to the question of the original form of religion, the translators are so little acquainted with the speculations on the subject, that they uniformly translate, 'Gefühl, *feeling*, as *sensation*; and tell us that Schleiermacher teaches that the Divine excites *sensation*, rather than reflection; that *sensation* is the original form of religion; and so on—one of the strangest perversions, arising from an ignorance of the subject, that could well have occurred. This whole section (§ 10), is so utterly obscured by blunders arising from a partial acquaintance with the nomenclature employed in philosophical writers, that we may very safely defy any one who reads it to come away with a single definite idea of what it is about. Here is one of them that will take up least room in pointing it out, 'The philosophy of idea is unacquainted with any other spiritual process as a logical one' (einen andern geistigen als den logischen), instead of *than* the logical one.

We had marked many more passages for quotation, but must leave them now. We shall only throw a few together without regard to order of occurrence.

§ 11, p. 26. 'None of these statements require to be directly defended' (verdient unmittelbare Gegenrede—merit direct *opposition*).

§ 15, p. 36. 'Wherever religion recovers from the effects of external perception' (von der Aeusserlichkeit—from externalism).

§ 15, p. 37. 'Entsinnlichung,' variously, spiritualizing interpretation, spiritualizing progress, super-sensualism.

§ 16, p. 42. 'No form of idolatry can be justified by consciousness, restrained and capable of discriminating between signs and thing (durch das erhaltne Bewusstsein vom Unterschiede—by the preserved consciousness of the distinction; to restrain and to retain are not quite the same thing).

P. 44. 'Greek ignorance of the bad and oriental polymathy constitute a contrast of errors.' What polymathy may be we do not profess to know, but what Nitzsch says, is, that the ignorance of the evil (as an antagonist deity), and the too great knowledge, recognition of that principle, which the oriental mythologies present (Griechisches Nichtwissen und Orientalisches vielwissen), are a contrast.

To prove the translators' knowledge of theological literature, here is a reference on page 48. Nitzsch writes, 's. Sack Bemerkungen über den Standpunkt der Schrift: Das Leben Jesu Krit. bearb. v. Strauss, Bonn, 1836,' which is a simple enough reference to 'Sack's Remarks on the Standpoint of the Work, The Life of Jesus, critically treated by Strauss'; but even this is not visible to our translators, who make it into two books, and say, see 'Sack, Bemerkungen über den Standpunkt der Schrift,' and 'Das Leben Jesu!' The next reference gives us the extraordinary transformation, 'Theol.-Studenkrit,' meaning thereby the 'Studien und Kritiken,' a periodical as well known as the 'Edinburgh Review.' The translators have attained to the knowledge that '§ 30,' in a reference, means 'page 30,' and translate accordingly; but they have not learned yet that 'H 3,' applied to a periodical, is 'number 3,' so that is left. These are small matters, but they show what are the translators' qualifications.

We pass over a whole mass of errors, some of them more glaring than any we have pointed out, and dip into the book a little further on, in the charitable hope that all that we have seen is the work of the least competent of the translators. We open at page 98, 'On the Canon of Scripture,' and the first sentence we find is, 'The doctrine of the unity St. Paul designates *καρων*, a word he derived from the popular language of the times, although the schools of philosophers had already, from the simplest laws of knowledge, employed the term;' a sentence which means nothing, and should be, 'The unity of doctrine' (Lehr-Einheit) &c. . . . The schools of philosophers had already employed the term in regard to the simplest law of knowledge, or rather conception (Erkenntnissgesetzen).

The same page will furnish us with an illustration of the translators' knowledge of Greek, to set beside one we have already given of their acquaintance with Latin. The Church

designated the Bible canon 'as distinctive from actual or possible heresies and pretended paradoxes!' (vorgeblichen Paradosis gegenüber.) If the clerical translator had studied his Greek Testament, he would have recognised *παραδοσίς*—a tradition—and not perpetrated the absurdity of writing a word which, as used here, has no sense at all. The sentence goes on—'without the supposition (or without thereby asserting) that the external and internal arguments had at any time spoken with altogether equal force for all the single writings ;' which is exactly reversed by the translation gravely asserting that 'they have ever spoken with equal force !'

Page 99, Nitzsch says that by the results of the Apostle's labours, 'die Weltgeschichte ihre Christliche Neuheit erhalten hat,' the world's history has received its Christian renovation; or, according to the translation, universal history 'has maintained its Christian novelty.'

We have but one more quotation to add, and then we shall dismiss this mangled misrepresentation. In section 131, p. 256, speaking of the doctrine of the union of natures in the Redeemer, Nitzsch tells us the ecclesiastical theory on the subject, 'Von Johann von Damask an bis zur entwickeltesten Lutherischen Lehre von der Mittheilung der Eigenschaften,'—'from John of Damascus even down to the most fully developed Lutheran doctrine of the participation of the attributes has,' &c., pointing to two periods, centuries apart, and to two doctrines, of which the one is to the other as germ to fully developed plant. The translation, with knowledge of Church history about equal to its knowledge of German (in which no idiom is more frequent than 'von—an bis,' expressive of from one period onwards to another), tells us that 'the Church theory of John of Damascus assumes the Lutheran doctrine in its most developed form !' Strange prescience John of Damascus must have had, and strange misnomer to call a doctrine Lutheran which was held in its most developed form in old Syria, when Luther's Germany was a black forest.

We have only to mention one thing more: it is the style in which the quotations from the Hebrew Scriptures are printed in this translation. We have taken the trouble to examine all, and here is the result. They are fifty-nine in number, all correct, so far as we have seen, in the German edition. In the English, twelve are correct, the remaining forty-seven are wrong; and, in most cases, there are as many errors in each as there are letters, and sometimes more when the vowel points are given.

We have only to say, in conclusion, that it is exceedingly difficult to exhibit in detached quotations the real character of errors in translation; a very little mud is scarcely perceptible in

one drop of the foul water ; but when you come to have a lake full, the small proportion in each drop makes a very palpable difference in the reflecting power. So with translations, it is the constant small errors, the omission of insignificant particles, the missing of shades of meaning, and the numberless things which seem trivial when isolated, but when in a mass make a medium so impure that the image to be reflected is scarcely visible. So in this volume, great part of it has no meaning at all, and much more a wrong one, but the causes are usually difficult to place before readers in extracts. We have, therefore, been obliged to give, not the most glaring errors, nor the most provoking, but a few that would most easily bear detaching ; and we fancy there is mud enough in this glassful for a reader to form a pretty fair guess at what the whole is. We have not exhausted one tithe of the blunders, nor one-fourth of the volume, but have simply set before our readers a specimen of a book which we cannot but regard as a miserable exhibition of ignorance in the translators of English, German, Greek, Latin, Hebrew, theology, philosophy, Scripture, and last, and emphatically least, their own powers. It fairly deserves the character 'opus incredibili inscitiâ, socordiâ, perfidiâ.'

ART. VII.—*Shirley; a Tale.* By Currer Bell, Author of 'Jane Eyre.'
In Three Volumes. London : Smith, Elder, and Co.

THE popularity of 'Jane Eyre' has prepared a large audience to welcome 'Shirley,' and we are neither surprised at the fact, nor disposed to find fault with it. The former work had many sterling qualities. It evinced a power of perception, description, and narrative, which writers of established repute might well envy. It had its faults, and some of them were prominent, but they were so far outweighed, that no intelligent reader could fail to prosecute the work to its close, or to feel, after its perusal, the charm with which it had encompassed him. It was specially attractive by the war it waged against mere conventionalisms, and its disregard of the ordinary trickery of novelists. In the dissection of character, and the nice tracing of internal struggles, it displayed a power infinitely superior to the clumsy contrivances of many contemporaries. Its character was its own, and its originality, though sometimes bordering on the improbable, was at once fascinating and instructive. With such an estimate of the former work we were not much disposed to play the captious critics with the present. We took it in hand with pleasure, and

though its opening chapters were somewhat unpromising, we found its charm deepen as we advanced, and were sorry when we arrived at its close. As was the case with its predecessor, it deals specially with the secrets of the female heart, which are disclosed through the medium of two young ladies, the one a niece and dependent of a clergyman, the other a rich heiress. Equally honest and truthful, they are in other respects as dissimilar in character as in position. Caroline Helstone is timid, retiring, and self-mistrustful, pure in thought, single-minded in her attachment, and thoroughly unselfish; while Shirley Keeldar is conscious of her position, easy in her manners, generous, yet fitful, confiding with the simplicity of a child in the honour of others, yet never regardless of her own; in every feeling a woman, yet shrewd, clear, and self-possessed. Such is the outline of the two heroines around whom gathers the interest and beauty of the fiction.

The work opens, as we have said, unpromisingly. The first chapter introduces us to three curates in the West Riding of Yorkshire, Mr. Donne, of Whinbury, Mr. Malone, of Briarfield, and Mr. Sweeting, of Nunnely. Their characters are sketched with no flattering pen, and two of their ecclesiastical superiors are painted in an equally unfavourable light. It must not be supposed that this arises from sectarian prejudice. The sketch of Moses Barraclough, the Ranter, and of Supplehough, the Baptist preacher, are companion pictures, and will serve to propitiate the Church reader, whatever may be thought by the worshipper of clerical sanctity. We can see no good end accomplished by the introduction of any of these personages. They are not needful to the tale. With the exception of Mr. Helstone, the rector of Briarfield, they form no part of the machinery by which its issue is evolved, and might have been omitted without injury to the plot or offence to the good taste of the reader. It is due, indeed, to the author to admit that his scene is laid nearly forty years back, when the rural districts of the kingdom bore no favourable testimony to the character of its clergy, and that a totally different sketch is given of Mr. Hall, the vicar of Nunnely, whose unobtrusive virtues command both esteem and love.

Caroline Helstone had lost her father—a man of worthless character—in early life. He had rendered his wife miserable, and had been separated from her some years prior to his death. Her mother she had never known, as she was taken from her in infancy, and the attempts she made to penetrate the mystery of her present condition had proved wholly futile. She was brought up by her uncle, the rector, who was little adapted either by nature or habits to secure her affection, or to train her mind. He did not treat her with cruelty, but was simply indifferent,

and had no sympathy with her youthful moods and aspirations. Mr. Helstone had a low opinion of the intellect and sphere of women. His own married life, though brief, had been unhappy—not from his wife's fault, but his own—and his contracted and hard mind now indulged in splenetic comments on the folly of embarking one's happiness on the caprices of so weak and feeble a creature as woman. Would that men who talk thus—and there are such in real life—could see themselves as others see them. For very shame they would hold their peace, for their slander recoils on themselves with terrible effect, marking them out as the most worthless of their kind. A feeble intellect, or a depraved heart, is the usual precursor of such nonsense. But to return to our narrative. Sensible of the deficiencies of her education, Caroline Helstone joyously availed herself of the instructions of a distant cousin, Hortense Moore, sister of Robert Moore, a manufacturer of the neighbourhood. As the latter occupies a prominent place in the narrative, we must introduce him to our readers :—

‘ Mr. Moore, indeed, was but half a Briton, and scarcely that. He came of a foreign ancestry by the mother's side, and was himself born, and partly reared, on a foreign soil. A hybrid in nature, it is probable he had a hybrid's feeling on many points—patriotism for one ; it is likely that he was unapt to attach himself to parties, to sects, even to climes and customs ; it is not impossible that he had a tendency to isolate his individual person from any community amidst which his lot might temporarily happen to be thrown, and that he felt it to be his best wisdom to push the interests of Robert Gérard Moore, to the exclusion of philanthropic consideration for general interests, with which he regarded the said Gérard Moore as in a great measure disconnected. Trade was Mr. Moore's hereditary calling. The Gérards of Antwerp had been merchants for two centuries back ; once they had been wealthy merchants, but the uncertainties, the involvements of business had come upon them ; disastrous speculations had loosened by degrees the foundations of their credit ; the house had stood on a tottering base for a dozen years ; and at last, in the shock of the French Revolution, it had rushed down a total ruin. In its fall was involved the English and Yorkshire firm of Moore, closely connected with the Antwerp house, and of which one of the partners, resident in Antwerp, Robert Moore, had married Hortense Gérard, with the prospect of his bride inheriting her father Constantine Gérard's share in the business. She inherited, as we have seen, but his share in the liabilities of the firm ; and these liabilities, though duly set aside by a composition with creditors, some said her son Robert accepted in his turn, as a legacy ; and that he aspired one day to discharge them, and to rebuild the fallen house of Gérard and Moore on a scale at least equal to its former greatness. It was even supposed that he took by-past circumstances much to heart, and if a childhood passed at the side of a saturnine mother, under forboding of coming evil, and a manhood drenched and blighted by the

pitiless descent of the storm, could painfully impress the mind, *his* probably was impressed in no golden characters.'—Vol. i. pp. 35, 36.

Moore was thoroughly unpopular with the working people of his district. Joe Scott, and the others in his employ, knew his worth, and estimated him highly, but his austere demeanour, fixedness of purpose, and resolute introduction of machinery into his mill, armed the district against him. His waggons were consequently stopt on Stilbro' Moor, and the machinery which was to brighten his fortunes was broken to pieces. The manufacturers were alarmed at the excited state of their workpeople, and one or two assassinations which occurred deepened their apprehensions. But Moore was not a man to quail before danger, and when a deputation, headed by Barracough, waited on him, to demand the substitution of hand power for that of machinery, he sternly rejected their prayer, and arrested their leader on a charge of having headed the mob on Stilbro' Moor. One of the deputies, William Farren, was a different man from his associates. Without work, and reduced to poverty, he was led to consort with criminals, but his heart was free from their villainy, and his strong, though homely sense, saw through their selfishness. 'He was hard-favoured, but modest, and manly-looking ;' and when Moore turned from the deputation to re-enter his mill, Farren arrested his steps by an appeal which ought to have moved his heart.

" 'I've not much faith i' Moses Barracough,' said he ; ' and I would speak a word to you myseln, Mr. Moore. It's out o' no ill-will that I'm here, for my part ; it's just to mak' a effort to get things straightened, for they're sorely a crooked. Ye see we're ill off,—varry ill off : wer families is poor and pined. We're thrown out o' work wi' these frames : we can get nought to do : we can earn nought. What is to be done ? Mun we say, wisht ! and lig us down and dee ? Nay : I've no grand words at my tongue's end, Mr. Moore, but I feel that it wad be a low principle for a reasonable man to starve to death like a dumb cratur' :—I will n't do't. I'm not for shedding blood : I'd neither kill a man nor hurt a man ; and I'm not for pulling down mills and breaking machines : for, as ye say, that way o' going on 'll niver stop invention ; but I'll talk,—I'll mak' as big a din as ever I can. Invention may be all right, but I know it isn't right for poor folks to starve. Them that governs mun find a way to help us : they mun mak' fresh orderations. Ye'll say that's hard to do :—so mich louder mun we shout out then, for so much slacker will t' Parliament-men be to set on to a tough job.'"

" 'Worry the Parliament-men as much as you please,' said Moore ; ' but to worry the mill-owners is absurd ; and I, for one, won't stand it.'"

" 'Ye're a raight hard 'un !' returned the workman. " 'Will n't ye gie us a bit o' time ?—Will n't ye consent to mak' your changes rather more slowly ?'"

““Am I the whole body of clothiers in Yorkshire? Answer me that!”

““Ye’re yourseln.”

““And only myself; and if I stopped by the way an instant, while others are rushing on, I should be trodden down. If I did as you wish me to do, I should be bankrupt in a month: and would my bankruptcy put bread into your hungry children’s mouths? William Farren, neither to your dictation, nor to that of any other, will I submit. Talk to me no more about machinery; I will have my own way. I shall get new frames in to-morrow:—If you broke these, I would still get more. *I’ll never give in.* . . .”

“His last words had left a bad, harsh impression: he at least, had “failed in the disposing of a chance he was lord of.” By speaking kindly to William Farren,—who was a very honest man, without envy or hatred of those more happily circumstanced than himself; thinking it no hardship and no injustice to be forced to live by labour; disposed to be honourably content if he could but get work to do,—Moore might have made a friend. It seemed wonderful how he could turn from such a man without a conciliatory or a sympathizing expression. The poor fellow’s face looked haggard with want: he had the aspect of a man who had not known what it was to live in comfort and plenty for weeks, perhaps months past; and yet there was no ferocity, no malignity in his countenance; it was worn, dejected, austere, but still patient. How could Moore leave him thus, with the words “I’ll never give in,” and not a whisper of good-will, or hope, or aid? —*Ib.* 195—197.

Farren returned to a cottage which poverty had rendered desolate. His children asked for food, and his large, true heart, groaned within him. They were half starving, and he wept. Need we wonder that his melting mood passed away, and that other and sterner thoughts followed? What might have ensued is left to conjecture. His downward course was arrested by an angel of mercy in the person of Mr. Hall, the vicar of Nunnely, who, in gentle terms, gained his confidence, and having furnished the means of temporary support, departed to secure for him those of permanent comfort.

In the meantime, Caroline had been growing up from the girl to early womanhood, and had become increasingly sensible of the solitariness and dependence of her condition. Her uncle had quarrelled with the Moores, and she was forbidden to continue her daily visits to the cottage at Hollow’s Mill. The rectory was a gloomy place for one so young and reflective, and the unsuspected passion which had entwined itself around her thoughts and plans, gave unutterable bitterness to her sorrows, and threw a sombre hue over all her views of life. To the superficial it may appear surprising that one so gentle should stake her happiness on a man so stern and unbending as Moore, but those who look further into the mysteries of our nature, will

readily discover the secret of her attachment. Stern to others, Moore was gentle and kind to her. She humanized his heart, and leaned confidingly on his manhood. Neither thought of love. Had they done so, the sensitive delicacy of Caroline would have recoiled from her cousin's presence, and Moore's prudence and sense of honour would have bid him quench a passion which his embarrassed circumstances then forbade his indulging. It was a terrible season for the young and gentle creature, and she struggled nobly against the misery which was settling down upon her. At this period of her history, a new personage is introduced. Miss Shirley Keeldar having just come of age, has arrived at Fieldhead, a neighbouring mansion, and Caroline is summoned by her uncle to accompany him thither. She obeys reluctantly, but a lasting friendship follows the introduction, and Mrs. Pryor, the companion and former governess of Miss Keeldar, attaches herself with special fervency to Caroline. Moore was the tenant of Miss Keeldar, and some slight circumstances lead Caroline to suspect that her new friend worshipped at the same shrine as herself. Her conviction of this terrible fact was confirmed by the following scene, which she witnessed on her return from the spot whither she was accustomed nightly to repair, in order to catch the reflection of the light from Moore's counting-house :—

‘ One night, the night after the incident of the note, she had been at her usual post, watching for her beacon—watching vainly ; that evening no lamp was lit. She waited till the rising of certain constellations warned her of lateness, and signed her away. In passing Fieldhead, on her return, its moonlight beauty attracted her glance, and stayed her step an instant. Tree and hall rose peaceful under the night sky and clear full orb ; pearly paleness gilded the building ; mellow brown gloom bosomed it round ; shadows of deep green brooded above its oak-wreathed roof. The broad pavement in front shone pale also ; it gleamed as if some spell had transformed the dark granite to glistering Parian ; on the silvery space slept two sable shadows, thrown sharply defined from two human figures. These figures when first seen were motionless and mute ; presently they moved in harmonious step, and spoke low in harmonious key. Earnest was the gaze that scrutinized them as they emerged from behind the trunk of the cedar. “ Is it Mrs. Pryor and Shirley ? ”

‘ Certainly it is Shirley. Who else has a shape so lithe, and proud, and graceful ? And her face, too, is visible : her countenance careless and pensive, and musing and mirthful, and mocking and tender. Not fearing the dew, she has not covered her head ; her curls are free : they veil her neck and caress her shoulder with their tendril rings. An ornament of gold gleams through the half-closed folds of the scarf she has wrapped across her bust, and a large bright gem glitters on the white hand which confines it. Yes, that is Shirley.

‘ Her companion, then, is, of course, Mrs. Pryor ?
 ‘ Yes, if Mrs. Pryor owns six feet of stature, and if she has changed her decent widow’s weeds for masculine disguise. The figure walking at Miss Keeldar’s side is a man—a tall, young, stately man—it is her tenant, Robert Moore.

‘ The pair speak softly, their words are not distinguishable ; to remain a moment to gaze is not to be an eaves-dropper ; and as the moon shines so clearly and their countenances are so distinctly apparent, who can resist the attraction of such interest ? Caroline it seems cannot, for she lingers.

‘ There was a time when, on summer nights, Moore had been wont to walk with his cousin, as he was now walking with the heiress. Often had she gone up the Hollow with him after sunset, to scent the freshness of the earth, where a growth of fragrant herbage carpeted a certain narrow terrace, edging a deep ravine, from whose rifted gloom was heard a sound like the spirit of the lonely watercourse, moaning amongst its wet stones, and between its weedy banks, and under its dark bower of alders.

‘ “ But I used to be closer to him,” thought Caroline ; “ he felt no obligation to treat me with homage ; I needed only kindness. He used to hold my hand ; he does not touch hers. And yet Shirley is not proud where she loves. There is no haughtiness in her aspect now, only a little in her port ; what is natural to and inseparable from her ; what she retains in her most careless as in her most guarded moments. Robert must think as I think, that he is at this instant looking down on a fine face ; and he must think it with a man’s brain, not with mine. She has such generous, yet soft fire in her eyes. She smiles—what makes her smile so sweet ? I saw that Robert felt its beauty, and he must have felt it with his man’s heart, not with my dim woman’s perceptions. They look to me like two great happy spirits : yonder silvered pavement reminds me of that white shore we believe to be beyond the death-flood ; they have reached it, they walked there united. And what am I—standing here in shadow, shrinking into concealment, my mind darker than my hiding-place ? I am one of this world, no spirit—a poor, doomed mortal, who asks, in ignorance and hopelessness, wherefore she was born, to what end she lives ; whose mind for ever runs on the question, how she shall at last encounter, and by whom be sustained through death ?

‘ “ This is the worst passage I have come to yet ; still I was quite prepared for it. I gave Robert up, and gave him up to Shirley, the first day I heard she was come ; the first moment I saw her—rich, youthful, and lovely. She has him now ; he is her lover ; she is his darling ; she will be far more his darling yet when they are married ; the more Robert knows of Shirley, the more his soul will cleave to her. They will both be happy, and I do not grudge them their bliss ; but I groan under my own misery : some of my suffering is very acute. Truly, I ought not to have been born : they should have smothered me at the first cry.” —Vol. ii. pp. 36—39.

What she thus witnessed confirmed her worst apprehension ; and though she continued to struggle against the hopelessness

of her condition, the clouds gathered thick and dark around her. Her physical strength failed, and when she refused to admit her illness, her pale countenance, disordered rest, and attenuated frame, convinced all around her—save her uncle—that her life was seriously endangered. Mrs. Pryor visited her daily, and on one occasion, when Caroline had been confined to her chamber about a fortnight, she ‘watched her very narrowly for some minutes: she took her hand, and placed her finger on her wrist; then, quietly leaving the chamber, she went to Mr. Helstone’s study. With him she remained closeted a long time—half the morning. On returning to her sick young friend, she laid aside shawl and bonnet: she stood awhile at the bedside, one hand placed in the other, gently rocking herself to and fro, in an attitude and with a movement habitual to her. At last she said,—“I have sent Fanny to Fieldhead to fetch a few things for me, such as I shall want during a short stay here; it is my wish to remain with you till you are better. Your uncle kindly permits my attendance: will it to yourself be acceptable, Caroline?”” We need scarcely say that the offer was accepted, though the sufferer was yet unapprised of the potent influence which had prompted it. Mrs. Pryor had previously suspected that the illness of her patient was mental rather than bodily, and the opportunity for observation now afforded, convinced her of the fact. Still she saw no remedy. Her attentions were most assiduous and tender. With maternal affection she watched over the young sufferer, marked the wanderings of her intellect, listened to her disjointed and incoherent remarks, and wept in very bitterness at the deepening gloom which encompassed her. The following scene in the sick chamber of Caroline clears up much of the mystery of the tale, and forms a good specimen of the author’s skill. The nurse has been soothing the invalid in the tenderest tones which a mother’s heart could prompt, when Caroline inquired,—

““Do you think I shall not get better? I do not feel *very* ill—only weak.””

““But your mind, Caroline: your mind is crushed; your heart is almost broken: you have been so neglected, so repulsed, left so desolate.””

““I believe grief is, and always has been, my worst ailment. I sometimes think, if an abundant gush of happiness came on me, I could revive yet.””

““Do you wish to live?””

““I have no object in life.””

““You love me, Caroline?””

““Very much,—very truly,—inexpressibly sometimes: just now, I feel as if I could almost grow to your heart.””

“I will return directly, dear,” remarked Mrs. Pryor, as she laid Caroline down.

Quitting her, she glided to the door, softly turned the key in the lock, ascertained that it was fast, and came back. She bent over her. She threw back the curtain to admit the moonlight more freely. She gazed intently on her face.

“Then, if you love me,” said she, speaking quickly, with an altered voice: “if you feel as if—to use your own words—you could ‘grow to my heart,’ it will be neither shock nor pain for you to know that *that* heart is the source whence yours was filled; that from *my* veins issued the tide which flows in *yours*; that you are *mine*—my daughter—my own child.”

“Mrs. Pryor——!”

“My own child!”

“That is—that means—you have adopted me?”

“It means that, if I have given you nothing else, I at least gave you life; that I bore you—nursed you; that I am your true mother: no other woman can claim the title—it is *mine*.”

“But Mrs. James Helstone—but my father’s wife, whom I do not remember ever to have seen, she is my mother?”

“She *is* your mother: James Helstone was *my* husband. I say you are *mine*. I have proved it. I thought perhaps you were all his, which would have been a cruel dispensation for me: I find it is *not* so. God permitted me to be the parent of my child’s mind: it belongs to me: it is my property—my *right*. These features are James’s own. He had a fine face when he was young, and not altered by error. Papa, my darling, gave you your blue eyes and soft brown hair: he gave you the oval of your face and the regularity of your lineaments: the outside *he* conferred; but the heart and the brain are *mine*: the germs are from *me*, and they are improved, they are developed to excellence. I esteem and approve my child as highly as I do most fondly love her.”

“Is what I hear true? Is it no dream?”

“I wish it were as true that the substance and colour of health were restored to your cheek.”

“My own mother! is she one I can be so fond of as I can of you? People generally did not like her, so I have been given to understand.”

“They told you that? Well, your mother now tells you, that, not having the gift to please people generally, for their approbation she does not care: her thoughts are centered in her child: does that child welcome or reject her?”

“But if you *are* my mother, the world is all changed to me. Surely I can live—I should like to recover——”

“You *must* recover. You drew life and strength from my breast when you were a tiny, fair infant, over whose blue eyes I used to weep, fearing I beheld in your very beauty the sign of qualities that had entered my heart like iron, and pierced through my soul like a sword. Daughter! we have been long parted: I return now to cherish you again.”

She held her to her bosom: she cradled her in her arms: she rocked her softly, as if lulling a young child to sleep.

“ ‘My mother! My own mother!’

‘The offspring nestled to the parent: that parent, feeling the endearment and hearing the appeal, gathered her closer still. She covered her with noiseless kisses: she murmured love over her, like a cussat fostering its young.

‘There was silence in the room for a long while.’—Vol. iii. pp. 17—20.

The tide of life was turned. A new impulse was given to the depressed and nearly worn-out spirit of Caroline. She felt there was yet an object for which to strive, and the love of the child furnished an antidote to the poison which had been drying up the springs of life. Caroline slowly recovered, and her convalescence was marked by a tranquillity and self-possession of which she had long been destitute.

In the meantime the other personages of the narrative had been pursuing their several vocations, but we must not further disclose the secrets of the tale. Shirley Keeldar was true to her friend notwithstanding suspicious circumstances. Her heart was as genuine as that of Caroline, though her mode of exhibiting it frequently partook of her own waywardness. Such of our readers as wish to pursue the tale further may have recourse to the volumes themselves. Our remaining space—and it is very brief—must be devoted to what some may possibly deem captious criticism. However this may be, we should be wanting in honesty were we to withhold our friendly suggestions.

As a whole, ‘Shirley’ produces a highly favourable impression. The power of its author is felt throughout. There is no deficiency of talent, no hard working up of materials, no dull mediocrity, retailing the phrases, and aiming at the effect, of superior intellects. On the contrary, the author is master of his theme. The stream gushes freely from an overflowing fountain, and its waters are refreshing. The work is strongly *individual*. Its excellences and its defects are equally free from the charge of imitation. There is a racy novelty in its style, in its minute analysis of character, in its descriptions of natural scenery, and in its combinations of complex, and often conflicting passions, which form an honourable contrast to the dull monotony of many works of fiction. On the other hand, it must be confessed that some of its descriptions are lengthened to weariness, and that minute, trivial circumstances, are frequently unduly magnified, and kept before the reader’s mind to the prejudice of other and more important facts. The style, also, is occasionally uneven and rugged, bespeaking want of due culture, or, at least, a negligence which ought to have been avoided.

A graver fault consists in the improbability of many parts of the narrative. This lies on the very surface, and cannot fail to

strike the most careless reader. As examples we may specify the style of address adopted by William Farren to Caroline and Shirley ; Mr. Donne's mode of pressing his money appeal on the latter ; the character of Martin Yorke, and his conduct to Caroline ; the unwomanly absence from the heart of Caroline of ' the green-eyed monster ;' and the mode in which Louis Moore and Shirley Keelder ultimately reveal to each other their natural and long-cherished passion. It is in no unfriendly spirit that we mention these exceptions. Such they undoubtedly are, whatever defence may be set up, and the author will do well to avoid them on again appearing before the public. Whatever outrages the sense of probability, betokens deficiency of judgment, want of skill, or a contemptuous estimate of the popular mind.

ART. VIII.—1. *A Bill (as amended by the Select Committee) to facilitate the Administration of Justice at the Central Criminal Court, and at Sessions of the Peace in and near the Metropolis.* Prepared and brought in by Mr. Attorney-General and Mr. Solicitor-General, 26th June, 1849.

2. *Law Magazine, August, 1849.*

3. *Jurist, August 11, 1849.*

MANY are the institutions of which England boasts. A representative House of Commons, freedom of the press, of speech, and of worship, and municipal self-government, are of the number. She claims the precedence of all modern nations in the possession and purity of these safeguards of popular rights. They are the subjects of her poetry and prose—her oratory and song. Her sons rejoice in them at home, and import them into foreign lands. They are the strength and beauty of her land.

But of none has she been prouder than of Trial by Jury. Associated with her earliest annals, she regards it with the affection of a parent for a first-born child. Its history brings up the names of Egbert, Ethelwolf, and Alfred, and discloses many deliverances from State persecution and priestly sway. Its fame is founded on no ordinary achievements for popular rights ; its influence is established by no trifling conquests over guilty power. Raised for the protection of the subject, it has been not unfitly termed, the Palladium of British Liberty. It has existed with undiminished respect and confidence until the present time—has

survived the greatest changes both in Church and State—changes that have swept away so much of our olden institutions, and introduced a new life, strength, and power, into public affairs.

To attack an institution so time-honoured is an act of no ordinary temerity ; to assail a system so long and well-established, a step of no slight import. Yet such has lately been done in the pages of the 'Jurist,' one of our ablest legal journals. That the expediency and indispensable utility of this institution has not, until lately, been seriously questioned, is a truth. It has existed upwards of a thousand years with public opinion entirely in its favour. Individuals might occasionally have questioned some of its verdicts, but none have dared to plead for the abolition of the tribunal. The thought would have been impious. To have attempted its destruction would have been deemed rebellion against the constitution in its most vital part, an onslaught on popular freedom, and the subjects' rights.

Yet the argument in favour of trial by jury derivable from the silence, or rather approval, of the past, though entitled to weight, is not conclusive. Why should it be so ? Mankind had for three thousand years acquiesced in the theory of the sun's motion around the earth. For two thousand did the Peripatetic philosophy rule over the learning of men. Vaccination, steam power, and the marvels of electricity, are but modern discoveries, and at first excited the ridicule and opposition of mankind. Then why should the silence or approval of a thousand years exclude all inquiry into the expediency of trial by jury ? That it yields *probable* evidence in its favour we admit. That it throws the onus of disproof on its opponents we readily grant.

The argument against 'trial by jury,' must assume one of a twofold aspect ; either that it is mischievous, or, if not positively mischievous, that it is unnecessary. It must, therefore, be of a positive or negative kind. We will attempt to sum up the arguments on both sides of this important question, and express the result of our convictions.

In investigating this subject, we shall content ourselves with the old, and, we believe, only safe mode of discovering truth ; viz., by analysis, combination, and comparison of facts, and deduction therefrom. The experimental system is a tried engine in the pursuits of science, and its fruits are as rich as they are multifarious. Previously to its introduction, philosophy, for the most part, was only a mass of sophistry and jargon, and the labours of science too frequently ended in childish chimeras, and mischievous theories. Almost all the great discoveries which have changed the entire aspect of learning and life, date their origin since its introduction ; while, at the present time, its disciples are as strong, and rich in their productions, as at any era

of the history of the world. We shall, therefore, not hastily abandon a system so tried, nor embrace any new organ for the discovery of truth, which is not confirmed by practical results. Until such an organ shall be revealed, we content ourselves with experimenting upon fact.

Is, then, the tribunal of a jury mischievous? The best way to answer this question is by analysis. Of what is the tribunal composed? Of twelve freeholders of the county or district where the trial takes place. The 'Jury Act,' 6 Geo. IV. c. 50, s. 1, enacts that,—

' Every man between the ages of twenty-one and sixty years, residing in any county in England, who has in that county, either in his own name, or in trust for him, ten pounds per annum above reprises, that is to say, of clear yearly income arising out of lands or tenements, whether freehold, copyhold, or customary tenure, or of ancient demesne, or of rents issuing out of any such lands or tenements; or in such lands, tenements, and rents taken together, in fee-simple, fee-tail, or for his own or other person's life; or who has in the same county twenty pounds per annum, above reprises, in lands or tenements held by lease or leases for the absolute term of twenty years or more, or for any term of years determinable on any life or lives; or any householder who shall be rated or assessed to the poor-rate, or to the inhabited house-duty in the county of Middlesex, on a value of not less than thirty pounds, or in any other county of not less than twenty pounds; or who shall occupy a house containing not less than fifteen windows, shall be qualified and liable to serve on juries.'

The same act contains exceptions in favour of the judges of the courts of justice, barristers, solicitors, magistrates, clergymen of all denominations, physicians, surgeons, apothecaries, officers of the army and navy, officers of the courts of justice, of customs and excise, the household servants of her Majesty, sheriff's officers, high constables, and parish clerks. All these are exempt from being summoned on juries.

The tribunal of a jury, then, consists of twelve individuals of the class we have described, and it must be admitted no better class of the public could be selected. The constitution of the tribunal is unexceptionable. Any objection must, therefore, be against the existence of the tribunal itself. Its opponents say,—

' We hold it to be a relic of ruder times, which it is quite a mistake to perpetuate in our system of administering justice. We are not here to inquire when it was a beneficial institution; we assume that it has been so for some given time, but we conceive its value has long been equal to that of fines and recoveries, and coats of mail; in other words, whatever it may have been, it has long ceased to be useful. The difficult cases that have to be decided at this day—and it is only the difficult ones that test the efficiency of the tribunal—are principally cases com-

plicated as to the law and the facts; cases, particularly in criminal matters, in which frequently all the material evidence is circumstantial, and requiring considerable acumen and knowledge to enable the jury to elicit the truth. Matters involving medical, chemical, and general scientific knowledge; matters requiring the habit of investigation of an educated mind; matters presented to the jury by men of the most sharpened intellects, often in a mode studiously destined to produce mystification—these are the subjects on which juries are called upon to exercise their functions. And of what sort of men are juries composed? Usually of persons with scarcely sufficient education to understand the ordinary conversational language of educated men, and quite incapable of any close or logical reasoning.'—*Jurist, supra.*

To the justness of many of the foregoing observations we fully subscribe. It is quite certain that a jury is in many cases incompetent to the discharge of the duties resting upon them, and frequently arrive at very improper, and, occasionally, absurd conclusions. It must be confessed that cases occur complicated in their texture, massive and conflicting in their facts, as disclosed by the witnesses, and subtle in their features and bearings, to which juries are generally unequal. Yet it is a mistake to suppose that they are altogether mischievous, even in such cases. There is generally found among the body one or more individuals of clear, intelligent mind, and fitted by experience in the world's affairs to decide on the credibility or incredibility of testimony, and to find the right way among a conflict of stories and complication of facts. These generally influence the rest by virtue of a natural law. The inferior gives way naturally to a superior mind in such circumstances, particularly when the latter has the moral qualities which secure confidence.

Moreover, as in such cases juries generally differ and retire to deliberate, the same law prevails of inferiority yielding to superiority, and the discussion which ensues cannot but be conducive to a right conclusion. It is also true that juries are often more competent to decide on the facts of a case, where the questions concern the ordinary affairs of human life, than even the judge. The previous education which they have received, from the circumstances in which they have been placed, qualify them to take a common-sense, practical view of such facts, while the judge, by virtue of a higher, more scholastic, and technical education, may be incapable of looking at them in a proper light. To adopt modern phraseology, the latter would be too much disposed to transcendentalism, while the jury would proceed by experience. We can also bear testimony, from practice, to the much juster views of ordinary evidence and ordinary facts frequently taken by juries, than were entertained by the judge.

But in the preceding remarks we have discussed the question as

though the jury were separate from, and independent of, the judge. This is not the case. It is the duty of the judge, and which is generally performed, as well to state, comment upon, and explain the evidence, as to expound the law of a case to the jury. There are thus secured for the right decision of the matter, two tribunals—the judge, and the jury—the one higher, more enlightened, systematic, and technical; the other more natural and practical. Both assist in the performance of the same work—the authority of the one being superior in all questions of the law, that of the other in all matters of fact. There is thus combined in the joint tribunal the learning of the judge with the experience of the jury—the logic of the one with the human nature of the other.

It is not unreasonable to suppose that the operation of so many minds of different character and power would be conducive to truth. It is not absurd to imagine that the different lights which they severally bestow upon the case may meet, unite, and promote its right understanding. It is not unwise to conjecture that this alliance may achieve for the cause of justice what each member alone might fail to accomplish. And, indeed, we may, from experience, say, that such is frequently the result. We can testify, that where the judge's summing up is clear and connected, the truth embodied therein is often, perhaps generally, received and adopted by the jury; while not unfrequently new and additional, and sometimes better, views of the case are entertained by the jury, who are thereby enabled to pronounce a juster verdict. The beneficial operation of the two tribunals, or rather of the two members of the tribunal, is thus shown. We believe the same testimony will be given by most of the intelligent and discriminating practitioners in our courts.

There is another light in which the tribunal of a jury may be viewed; viz., as furnishing additional guarantee or security for the subjects' rights. This was the ground which principally led to its establishment, and offers, probably, the strongest reason against its abolition.

It must not be forgotten that the judges are appointed by the Crown. It is true, they hold office for life, yet their connexion and sympathies are naturally with the higher classes to which they belong, and with the Government which appointed them. Their feelings and prejudices, therefore, are in favour of their class. We do not mean by these remarks to impute to them generally, an intentional leaning or bias in favour of any authority or class. We only point out a law of human nature, which is very general, yea, almost universal, in its operation. The relations of master and servant, patron and protégé, sovereign and minister, engender superiority and command on the one side, and gratitude and obedience on the other. Where favour is

granted, obligation is incurred. This is the natural result of things.

But to pass from principles to fact, we are indeed proud to confess that a Jeffreys, infamous for oppressive cruelty, is rare on the bench. He is not often found in the records of the past, while at the present day, we verily believe, he has no antitype in our land. We believe that the higher tone and texture of the men who supply our bench with judges, combined with the advanced civilization and public opinion of the age, will prevent the advent of another Jeffreys to the judgment seat. Yet the judges are men of the same nature with ourselves, and fallible. It is well in human affairs to provide against a possibility of evil, even though it may appear distant. The existence or enjoyment of a good is one matter, while the guarantee or security for its continuance, and against the recurrence of evil, is another. The union of both constitutes perfection.

We, therefore, regard juries as valuable, and even necessary, on the ground of the protection which they afford to the subject. They are the proper element to represent the public at large. They thus counterbalance the judge, who may be regarded as the representative of power. They are the subject's set-off against the influence of that power. Apart from the actual benefits resulting from this popular element in the judicial tribunal, it is valuable from the satisfaction it affords to the suitor and the public. They are gratified that they have a representative in court, of the same rank, and possessing common feelings, sentiments, and sympathies with themselves. In case of defeat they cannot blame the constitution of the court, possessing, as it does, a popular, as well as an aristocratic branch. On the other hand, defeat would be often mitigated by the fact that the verdict was not swayed by the aristocratic feelings of the judge, but that it received the concurrence of a popular power. Complaint is therefore excluded, excepting such as would be expressed against the most perfect tribunal which can be founded by man.

Nor must we forget that during the past many, great, and glorious deliverances from state persecution and despotic sway have been effected by juries against the utmost power of the bench. Many are the instances which the history of this country reveals of the triumph of popular right over arbitrary authority achieved by juries alone. Glorious have been the struggles of this democratic branch of our courts of justice for freedom and truth. Earnestly has it fought, and the record of its achievements should awaken both admiration and gratitude.

Nor is it impossible that the future may present occasions for similar strife. The battle of liberty, civil and religious, may have to be fought again, yea, on harder ground, and with fiercer

combatants. Looking at the present position and future prospects of the world, we perceive some slight evidence of a new struggle between antagonistic principles—a struggle as momentous and virulent (though perhaps of a different nature), as those which have heretofore been waged between feudalism and democracy, episcopacy and puritanism. Yea, we may be upon the threshold of this fresh conflict. Should it come, where, in our courts of justice, are the people to look for protection? Where is to be their safeguard? The experience of the past answers, in a jury of yeomen of the soil, or merchants of the towns. These have ever been in times of commotion the bulwark of freedom, the palladium of right.

The reader will have anticipated our answer to the questions proposed, whether juries are mischievous, or, if not positively mischievous, unnecessary. Our observations will have prepared him to find that we consider the tribunal of a jury neither mischievous nor unnecessary. Indeed, we may express our opinions in a positive form, that we consider the tribunal as both useful and necessary. We therefore give a decided negative to the proposal of abolishing this time-honoured institution.

Yet, though adverse to its abolition, we may become converts to a change. We can distinguish between a jury in civil and criminal trials—between its presence in a *Nisi prius* and a Crown court. Civil actions and trials concern only the suitors—the parties themselves: criminal trials concern the public. In the former, subject only is arrayed against subject; in the latter, the Crown, as representing the community, stands against a guilty member. In the event of a wrong verdict being given in civil cases, the individual suitor alone suffers; in case of an improper conclusion being pronounced in criminal trials, the public at large are injured, for a guilty member is cast unpunished upon society. On the other hand, a jury is required in criminal cases for the protection of the prisoner. The judge is in such cases too much the representative of the Crown—the opponent of the accused—to be entrusted alone with the decision of the case. He is apparently, if not in fact, too much the nominee of power—a partisan. Therefore, to guard against the suspicion of foul play, which in this case would be equally injurious with its existence, we protest against the abolition of a jury, even with the prisoner's consent, in our criminal courts. Its presence is there required by public justice.

On the other hand it *might*, although we do not say positively it *would*, be advantageous to dispense with juries in civil cases, unless required by both or either of the parties. That is, that such cases shall be tried by the judge alone, unless both or either of the parties should previously give notice requiring the attend-

ance of a jury. As in civil cases the individual suitors alone suffer the consequences of an improper decision, the choice of the judicial tribunal, whether the judge alone, or assisted by a jury, might, with propriety, be left to the parties interested. They would be concluded by their choice, and no third party would be damnedified. This is the course pursued in the County Courts, where no jury sits unless required by both, or either of the parties concerned. The judge alone decides. The practice appears warranted by the nature of the court, and, we believe, gives public satisfaction.

The present law requires the unanimous verdict of the twelve jurors. The effect of this rule is, that jurors are frequently confined for twenty-four hours, or longer, in consequence of the dissent of one or more jurors. They often fail even ultimately to agree, in which case they are discharged, and the action is at an end. If desired, a fresh suit must be commenced, and tried before another jury.

This rule, requiring unanimity among the jurors, is as contrary to sound philosophy as it is inconvenient in practice. It assumes the certainty of twelve jurors agreeing in every case which may be brought before them, though it is matter of every day observation that two minds of equal power, and like character, frequently arrive at opposite conclusions on the plainest questions brought before them. How much more likely, then, is a difference of opinion between twelve minds of probably very unequal power and distinct character, on questions embracing a complex mass of facts, with subtle features and distinctions? To which may be added, the frequent influence of prejudice, feeling, and bias, on the part of one or more of the number. To require unanimity in such cases, is, therefore, to violate the clearest deductions of reason, as well as the soundest maxims of experience.

The rule we would suggest, is, that the decision of the majority should suffice, and in case of equality, that the foreman should have the casting voice. This modification of jury trial is as much dictated by reason as experience, and the wonder is, that it should have remained so long unaccomplished. With this change, we believe, the British system of trial by judge and jury, where questions of fact are in dispute, is as perfect as legislation or jurisprudence can devise. Its abolition should therefore be firmly resisted by the public, and the tribunal be still regarded as the palladium of British liberty.

The preceding remarks are confined to common or petty juries, and not to the institution of a grand jury. This requires separate notice.

The bill at the head of this article, which was introduced by

the Attorney-General into the House of Commons, during the last session, would, if passed, abolish grand juries at the Central Criminal Court, and at all Sessions of the Peace within the City of London, or the Metropolitan Police District. It required that all charges should first be investigated by a justice or justices of the peace, before the party is committed for trial at any of those courts. After investigation and committal by a justice or justices, the prisoner would be arraigned for trial, without further inquiry before a grand jury.

The question suggested is, whether the tribunal of a grand jury be desirable within the district comprised in the Attorney-General's bill, and also in the rest of the kingdom.

Grand juries were instituted for the protection of the public against malicious and unfounded prosecutions. They were established for the security of the prisoner. The design of the institution was to prevent the exposure and ignominy of a public trial without sufficient grounds. The tribunal is composed of twelve or more individuals, generally of a higher grade than those who constitute our common or petty juries. At the assizes in the country, it is composed of the first people both in rank and property in the respective counties. Is the institution still necessary?

The object for which it was instituted was laudable—the security of the public. The institution was, doubtless, very necessary in former ages, when power and property were in comparatively few hands, and intelligence was but little diffused. Moreover, the passions and dispositions of men were in those days more malignant and ferocious than they are now. The character of the times, therefore, affords less reason for double security and extra caution against the evil attempts of men.

Still the object for which grand juries were instituted—the protection of the public from unfounded prosecutions, is so important and desirable, that it applies, though with less force, at the present day. The question is, Can the tribunal be dispensed with consistently with the security of the public?

The subject presents a different feature as it applies to the district comprised in the Attorney-General's bill, and to the kingdom at large. The former has the benefit of the services of a stipendiary magistracy, unsurpassed for zeal and ability. All investigation before such a tribunal must be superior to any which can take place before a grand jury, and must furnish equal and even greater guarantee for the justness of a prosecution. A subsequent preliminary investigation before a grand jury would therefore appear to be unnecessary, if not positively mischievous, from the inferiority of the tribunal. Moreover, respectable, and apparently competent evidence, was produced before the com-

mittee on the bill, showing the evil effects, direct and indirect, of grand juries in the Metropolitan Courts. An investigation before a metropolitan stipendiary magistrate would therefore appear to be sufficient for all purposes preliminary to trial, while the further inquiry before a grand jury would appear to be unnecessary, if not positively mischievous. There is therefore foundation for the Attorney-General's bill.

But the question assumes a different aspect as it regards the country at large, where there is no stipendiary magistracy. The inferiority of country magistrates presents the subject in a different light. The latter are appointed solely from consideration of their property and rank. Their fitness for its duties is never for a moment entertained. Comparatively few of the class have had a legal education; nor is the training which the great majority of them have received at all calculated to qualify them for the important duties of a justice of the peace. On the other hand, they are for the most part incompetent for their discharge, and feel it. They therefore appoint a solicitor to the office of their clerk, upon whose advice they generally act; and too often the bench becomes a tool in the hands of its clerk for selfish and sinister purposes.

An investigation before a country magistrate is therefore a very different matter to a similar inquiry before a Metropolitan Police Court. Independently of the vast inferiority of the tribunal, the country magistrate has his local connexions, his prejudices, antipathies, and feuds. He is almost always arrayed in antagonism to the merchant and working class, besides being often embroiled in game and trespass disputes. Elections excite his wrath, while public meetings, the press, and all other means of agitation, have his inveterate hate. The 'marked men' in his neighbourhood are many, while a still larger class have his dislike. To entrust such a personage with the power of consigning his neighbours at will to a criminal dock, without the intervention of a grand jury, would be as imprudent as dangerous. His powers are already too extensive, while to confer upon him the absolute power in question, would be unwise. Until, therefore, the country at large receive the benefit of a stipendiary magistracy equally with the metropolis, we shall firmly resist the abolition of grand juries. They are at present the necessary counterpoise of the country magistrate who commits. There is more security for justice in a multitude, than in one.

ART. IX.—*The Case of Ireland Stated.* By Robert Holmes, Esq.
Third Edition. Dublin : James McGlashin. 8vo. Pp. 102.

DURING the autumn of 1847, we spent several weeks in Ireland, and having travelled through nearly every county, we had an opportunity of seeing the condition of the people in each of the four provinces. On our return we called attention to 'land improvement' in that country ; and more particularly to the efforts of Lord George Hill, at Gweedore, a wild tract on the western shore of Donegal, where the inhabitants were reduced to a state of savage ignorance and barbarism, until that benevolent nobleman attempted, and with surprising success, to reform their morals and change their habits.* A similar visit in August and September of last year, has enabled us to ascertain the working of a somewhat kindred experiment in the counties of Mayo and Galway—the results of which are, if possible, even more striking—and which we will endeavour, as briefly as possible, to describe.

It is generally known, we presume, that the Society of Friends some time ago determined not to expend the large balance which remained of their Relief Fund in gifts of money and food to the Irish poor, but in some schemes of reproductive labour, in experiments to improve the fisheries of Galway, and in efforts to introduce an improved system of agriculture, with a view, chiefly, of teaching the cottier, and small farmer, how to prepare and till the land, so as to produce green crops, which were almost unknown and unused in these counties. Such a method of procedure, it was thought, and rightly, too, as the result has shown, would not only afford extensive relief to the poor, by giving them steady employment, at the ordinary wages of the county, but would become a permanent good, by introducing various kinds of useful vegetables, and by stimulating the industry, and developing the skill of the labouring class. It was hoped, too, that a description of agriculturists might be raised up in Ireland, hitherto almost unknown, namely, independent, competent, skilled, labourers. Such was the nature of the undertaking, and such were its objects—an experiment which all intelligent friends of Ireland will heartily approve, and if successful, sincerely rejoice in. We have heard with pleasure, since commencing this article, that the Committee of the

* Eclectic Review, December, 1847.

Baptist Irish Society have resolved on pursuing a similar course on some land near the town of Ballina.

A very large quantity of land in Mayo and Galway having been thrown out of occupation by the emigration or death of the former holders, the landlords let some two thousand acres to the Committee of Friends, rent free, for six months, considering the improvement of the farms, by the superior cultivation intended, a fair equivalent for the loss of half a year's rent. The poor rates and county cess were to be paid by the Committee.

In the spring of 1848, several hundreds of poor persons were set to work on these lands. They were placed under the instruction of an experienced agriculturist from Dublin, assisted by small farmers and land bailiffs of the district, who were appointed overlookers of parties varying from twenty to fifty. It was determined that hand and spade labour alone should be employed. All agricultural machines were set aside. The object not being a profitable investment, but the improvement and relief of the poor, we think the gentlemen who directed the experiment exercised a sound judgment. The spade, hoe, shovel, and rake, were the only implements used. Even horses and carts were forbidden. Manure was brought to certain spots, and thence was carried, by the labourers themselves, in creels, to the places where it was to be laid on. We saw the field in which the experiment was begun, and traced its progress to the end. It was alike curious and interesting to contrast the cultivation and crops in this field, and in others about it, in which the poor people had wrought, *after* being taught how to perform the tasks assigned them. Their progress was rapid and successful beyond all expectation.

We went over some five hundred acres, near Ballina, treated in the way described. We saw crops of turnips, mangel, carrots, cabbage, beans, peas, and flax, of which any farmer might be proud. The style of cultivation was very superior—the drills perfectly straight, the processes of thinning, hoeing out, earthing up, and weeding, were neatly and thoroughly done, and proved the readiness and capacity of the people to learn. Put them under proper instruction, and pay them even the low wages of the country, *but pay them regularly*, and it will be a matter of grateful surprise how soon a listless, thoughtless, improvident, and lazy cottier, will be changed into a cheerful, intelligent, and industrious artizan. We are satisfied that if means could be devised to employ the destitute poor of Ireland, during the winter, at the rate of sixpence a day, the mass of the people would be thankful, and all danger of an outbreak would vanish. We were told by the gentleman who took us over several farms, that the bulk of the people, whom we saw working cheerfully

and skilfully, at wages averaging, according to their age, from fourpence to tenpence a day, did not, twelve months ago, know the difference between a parsnip and a carrot; and they were still more ignorant, if possible, of the method of cultivating these useful roots.

The whole of the soil was dug by the spade from twelve to fifteen inches deep, and, in some cases, dug twice over. Guano, and other manures, were employed according to the best known rules; and the cost of cultivation was heavy, about £7 10s. per *Irish acre*, nearly one and three quarters English, exclusive of the charge for manure. Yet it was the general opinion of intelligent persons who had seen the farms, that the crops would more than repay the outlay.

Beside the benefit of introducing a better method of cultivating the ordinary crops, and a variety of useful vegetable productions, into a district almost wholly confined to the growth of oats, barley, and potatoes, a very large number of labourers, accustomed only to the most inferior processes of agriculture, have been taught superior modes of culture. Moreover, we observed several of the small farmers around imitating the example set them; and over the face of the whole district, for many miles, in the vicinity of Ballina, the improvement observed was so marked, that we could scarcely credit the fact of its having been accomplished in less than twelve months. Yet so it was.

The late famine in Ireland has very nearly depopulated large districts in the west. On several extensive properties more than one half of the farm-houses and cabins are deserted. This enables the proprietor, *without ejecting a tenant*, to throw several small farms into one of moderate size. A better class of farmers may thus be raised; and the small occupier will become, what he ought ever to have been, a farm labourer. The middle man, once a useful enough personage, but latterly the scourge and pest of the rural districts of Ireland, is fast disappearing, and the speedy extinction of the whole race will be a great blessing.

The loss of rent to those proprietors whose income is wholly derived from Irish property, and who have been resident, and have fulfilled their duties during the late dreadful scene of want and death, is enormous. The constantly increasing poor's rate falls heavily on them. Having no other property than their Irish estates, they are placed in circumstances of extreme difficulty, and are entitled to much sympathy. For the absentee, who spends his income abroad, leaving his tenantry, without any effort to help them, to the mercy of an agent, we have no pity.

The passing of the late bill for the sale of encumbered estates,
VOL. XXVI.

though in many respects defective, will nevertheless operate beneficially. Already some large properties have changed hands. Heavy incumbrances will soon be removed. Parties with a delusive rent-roll of ten thousand a-year, will sink into their proper place. They will no longer have to maintain a painful and perpetual struggle between actual poverty and nominal wealth. Their expenditure will be reduced to a level with their means, and a false position being abandoned, they will become far happier and more useful members of society.

There is now a fine opportunity for men of small capital, who cannot get a moderate sized farm in this country, to enter into business in Ireland. Farms of any extent may be had on leases of twenty-one years, and at very moderate rents. No respectable tenant would be rejected, for at present there are, in many districts, no tenants at all. They would not, consequently, come into collision with those feelings and customs, out of which agrarian outrages have mainly arisen, and which have been the curse of the peasantry, and have rendered them infamous. These farms would be let on an average of twenty shillings the *statute* acre, and the leases would be clogged with no annoying clauses as to methods of culture, and rotation of cropping; in short, those conditions only would be inserted, which it is equally the interest of tenant and of landlord to maintain. Persons of this class going to Ireland, might benefit themselves and the people too. They would be employers and teachers, and would originate a class of yeomanry which that country has not possessed, to any extent, for centuries, and the want of which has been a great social evil.

Moreover, gentlemen of property in these days, when profitable investments of money are difficult things to secure, would do well to look to Ireland. Owing to the course of recent events, and the probability of a large quantity coming into the market, the price of land is low. Are they afraid of Tipperary? Then there are Mayo, Galway, Clare, Sligo, and other counties, where the people have always been peaceable and well-disposed. Let the same fairness and consideration be manifested towards their tenantry which landlords boast of showing in this country, and they would soon gather round them an affectionate, honest, and industrious race, who would cherish towards them the gratitude and fidelity for which the Irish people, when kindly treated, are proverbial.

We are well aware that these sentiments are not popular in England—nay, the contrary opinions are generally entertained. But we speak what we know. If proof be wanted, we point to the property of Sir C. Stiles, near Stranorlar, and to Lord George Hill's success at Gweedore, both in the county of Donegal. Indeed, anywhere in Ireland where landlords are not embarrassed,

and where they look after their own affairs, and are just and considerate to their tenants, you see improvement, sobriety, and peace. Pity it is that the instances are comparatively few. But that is not the fault of the people. If, where such proprietors are found, you see what we have described, that is enough for our argument, and we hold the case to be proved.

We are satisfied that one of the most speedy and efficient remedies for Ireland's misery, would be the entire abolition of all peculiar privileges of landed, over personal property. Land, as well as money or any other chattels, must be made liable for debt. Those parties who benefit by the present state of the law, would, of course, raise a violent outcry. But they are about the least useful class, while, for their exclusive benefit, laws are upheld which inflict great wrongs on large masses of the people, and, in Ireland particularly, are the source of social misery and crime, to a majority of the population.

We have great doubts whether any attempt to give legal expression and existence to what is called tenant-right would be a benefit. Tenant-right in Ulster, for instance, is a very singular affair. A man takes a farm, simply as a tenant-at-will, or for some stated period; and at the expiration of one year, or more, as the case may be, his landlord gives him, or he gives his landlord, notice to quit. On this tenancy, whether long or short, a certain right is customary, which means, in fact, a certain sum of money equivalent to the supposed improvement of the farm. The landlord refuses to give what the tenant asks, or to give anything at all. It is put up for public competition. If any one is willing to pay the rent fixed on the farm, and to give the party about to leave something for his interest, this person becomes the future occupier, and tenant-right assumes another form, *the landlord must take this new tenant.* This is the custom in Ulster. Mr. Sharman Crawford wants to legalize it. We think he is wrong. Public opinion settles such questions far better than the legislature. How can Parliament define and fix the value of such a varying interest as this? From all we could learn in Ireland, we are convinced the matter had better be left as it is, for it occasions very little inconvenience to any parties, and, in many respects, is advantageous. To do it away by any legislative act would be madness, and involve landlords and tenants throughout Ulster in very serious conflict. This curious custom is, we believe, confined to the northern province.

These observations are not intended to apply to the general question, how far a tenant who has greatly improved his farm, is equitably entitled to share with the landlord the benefit which the capital and skill employed have conferred on the property. All disinterested persons must admit, that in leaving a property so improved, the tenant has a fair claim to pecuniary compensa-

tion. This may become the subject of legal enactment, and be settled as a matter of right, not of favour. Such a law would be hailed as wise and just in England, as well as in Ireland. We have no great hope, however, that the present government will have the courage to grapple with the question. They will still go on trying palliatives, instead of rooting out the evil. The Whig party has unhappily lost its nerve. It wants the decision which marked its rulers in former days, when the British throne was secured to the House of Hanover, and the genius of Walpole or of Chatham, held in check the domestic and foreign enemies of the new dynasty. The glories of Whiggism are historic, and if we judge from the policy of Lord John Russell and his associates, they are not very likely to be revived. Sir Robert Peel has recently counselled the citizens of London to emulate the example of their predecessors, by investing their superabundant wealth in the purchase and improvement of Irish estates. A Committee of Inquiry has been appointed; and though we do not anticipate much from it, the ultimate tendency of its labours cannot fail to be beneficial. One thing at least is promising. Sir Robert having entered the field, his political rival—as in the case of the Corn-laws—may be expected to move at more than his usual pace.

Statesmen may do much for Ireland. Men of capital and benevolence may do more, if they combine their efforts, and form plans suited to the condition and character of the people. But Christians can do more than all. It is for a lamentation and a mourning, that Christian men have no higher sense of their duty and power. They have done more, however, than meets the public eye, or than the public knows. But if ever there was a time to make the effort, on an adequate scale, that time is *now*. British benevolence has made an impression on the Irish mind, which a whole generation will remember and feel. It was *that* which broke the arm of rebellion. It took away all moral cause of enmity against the Saxon. It has stopped the mouth of the applier to difference in blood and religion. Clouds, dark and dense, yet hang over the land. But they are breaking. Gleams of light are piercing through. We feel assured ‘there is a good time coming’ yet. Politicians may rely on fleets and armies to keep her agitated and discontented people—discontented, however, through want—in a state of submission. But the gospel will conquer them. It will bind them to us in love. It will silence their strife, allay their animosities, assuage their griefs, and give them, and us too, peace; teaching them the great lesson, that we are all the creatures of God; that *one is our master, even Christ, and all we are brethren*. Happy day for Ireland when her sons shall have learned this lesson. But the Church of Christ must teach them, and it alone can do it.

Brief Notices.

The Reformer's Almanack and Political Year-Book for 1850. London: Aylott and Jones.

The Financial Reform Almanack for 1850. London : Charles Gilpin.

THESE publications are signs of the times which no wise man will overlook. Trifling in themselves, they betoken a state of the public mind which our rulers will do well to heed. They are the supply promptly rendered to the new demand which has arisen, and the information they furnish will help forward the movement of the age. 'The Reformer's Almanack' is published under the sanction of the 'National Reform Association,' while 'The Financial' claims the patronage of the 'Liverpool Financial Reform Association.' We are sorry to see two works so kindred in their professed object dividing the patronage of the public, and are bound, in common justice to the publishers of the former, to say that they ought to have been exempted, on the part at least of the friends of reform, from the rivalry thus attempted. We have often protested against the practice of publishers bringing out cheap editions of Continental and American works immediately after any one of their number has, at considerable expense, created a demand for it; and our objections apply with tenfold strength to the course pursued by the editor of 'The Financial Reform Almanack.' When public principle is pleaded, special care should be taken to avoid the low trickery which the competition of trade unhappily engenders. There was the less occasion for it in the present instance, as the 'Reformer's Almanack,' to use the words of Mr. Cobden, 'is brimful of information, and is certainly the best and cheapest sixpenny-worth of political knowledge ever offered to the public.'

It was to effect the very object which Mr. Cassell pleads in justification of his project, and to furnish, to use his own words, 'in a convenient form, and at a convenient price, a text-book for the reformer,' that 'The Reformer's Almanack' was published, 'and the press have united in testifying that that design has been fully realized. The public will, therefore, be able to estimate aright the value of this apology for an ill-disguised plagiarism.

'The proprietors of "The Reformer's Almanack" desire nothing more than that the two publications may be fairly compared, and each receive just that amount of patronage which it may be found to deserve. But they think that, in justice to themselves, the public should be informed—1, That the idea of "The Financial Reform Almanack" has been borrowed from the "Reformer's Almanack," which has already given much of the information which it contains; and 2, That although the price of the "Reformer's Almanack" is sixpence, and that of its

rival but threepence, the former contains eighty-eight pages, and several lengthy original articles, while the latter has but fifty-eight pages (advertised as sixty-four), and is, for the most part, a compilation of short extracts from the "Standard of Freedom," the "Liverpool Financial Reform Tracts," and other publications.'

There is scarcely any topic bearing on the question of reform in its broadest sense, on which the 'Reformer's Almanack' does not furnish exact and most important information. The editor has spared neither labour nor expense to render his work complete, and we strongly recommend it as a text-book to the reformers of the kingdom. They have a deep interest in promoting the circulation of such a work, as it is only by an extensive sale that its conductors can continue the outlay necessary to its production. The present is greatly superior to the work of last year, and the fault will be chargeable on the public if the same progression be not observable in its future appearances. 'The Reformer's Almanack' is the cheapest sixpenny-worth with which the press has furnished us.

The Harmony of History with Prophecy : an Exposition of the Apocalypse. By Josiah Conder, Author of the 'Literary History of the Old Testament,' &c. &c. London : Shaw, pp. xii., 532.

THIS work is not by any means to be confounded with the mass of writings of which the Apocalypse has, for the last two centuries, been the subject. We know not one of them with which it may not, in some respect or other, be advantageously contrasted. To most of them it is incomparably superior. Its characteristic excellences lie in the soundness of its principles, its well-digested learning, its lucid expositions, and its judicious conciseness.

The principle of exposition which Mr. Conder has adopted appears prominently on his title-page ; it is the Harmony of History with Prophecy. He is, therefore, neither preterist nor futurist ; or, to explain our meaning to those who may be innocent of all familiarity with these dark words, he neither holds with Professor Moses Stuart, that the mass of the predictions in the Apocalypse has been long ago fulfilled, nor with Mr. Tyso, that their fulfilment has yet to begin with the second advent of Christ. Consistently with his principle, he has conscientiously abstained 'from any attempt to lift the veil which conceals the future by conjectural anticipations.' The Revelation was, he apprehends, intended to be a guide to the *general expectations* of the Church in all ages, and more especially to sustain the faith and patience of the persecuted and oppressed servants of Christ under the protracted conflict, first between Paganism and Christianity, and subsequently between the despotic powers of apostate Christendom and the adherents to the primitive faith. While Mr. Conder has derived his historical illustrations from all appropriate sources, he has been eminently happy in his use of them. Writers, from whose intention nothing could be more remote than that their works should be made to serve the cause of religion, are here compelled to give their evidence in favour of the authority and inspiration of the Christian Scriptures. As specimens,

we may refer to the extracts selected from Gibbon to illustrate the visions which followed the sounding of the fifth and sixth trumpets.

Agreeing very frequently with Mr. Elliott, far more, indeed, than he does with any other writers in his historical exposition of the symbolical imagery of the Apocalypse, Mr. Conder has immeasurably the advantage of him in literary skill, particularly in condensation, and in the general excellence of his style. Good taste and long experience combined, have rendered Mr. Conder a very agreeable and effective writer. While he has abstained from the copious diffuseness of Elliott or Benzel, he has, with equal judgment, avoided the opposite error of a superficial or barren conciseness.

Believing that, whether regarded as to its plan or execution, this volume is one of the best, in some respects the very best, of all that we have ever seen on the Apocalypse, we are glad, though not able to enter minutely into its details, to observe that in the interpretation of chapter xx. 4—6, Mr. Conder has expressed himself very decidedly, and with great force of argument, against the pre-millenial theory of our Lord's second advent, and his personal, visible reign with the saints over the earth during the millennium. He is also equally explicit in rejecting the 'Millennarian' interpretation of the 'first resurrection.' Believing that the theories here impugned are not only baseless, but deeply injurious, we are gratified in being able, on this ground, as well as on those before adverted to, to give the volume before us our heartiest recommendation.

Sunrise in Italy, &c.—Reveries. By Henry Morley. London : Chapman.

THE greater part of this volume is occasioned by the recent continental movements, and bears the successive titles—'Sunrise in Italy,' 'Morning in Europe,' 'Morning Clouds.' The author is a man of cultivated, thoughtful mind, and kindly heart, led by his convictions and his disposition to keen sympathy with these struggles. He is an ardent believer in human progress, writes a great deal about religion, and exhibits as his own faith, the belief of the identity under all forms, Pagan and Christian, of the devout spirit—while Shelley is an especial subject of eulogy on account of his religious opinions—or emotions, we should rather say, as our author cares not for opinions. Dissenting most emphatically from all this, and seeking our vindication for speaking of it in the author's frequent introduction of such topics, we willingly point out the volume as one in which there are many passages—very many—of exquisite delicacy and beauty, sometimes combined with bursts of concentrated fiery energy, not often found in union with such characteristics. There is occasionally needless obscurity, and the measure in which the greater part of the volume is written, is either unfortunately chosen, or the author has not yet perfect mastery over it. There is, at the same time, a monotony and a jolt, the one arising from the perpetual recurrence of the pause on the same syllable, and the other from the end of a line and the end of a clause seldom coinciding; but these defects do not destroy the pleasure derived from the volume.

The Jubilee Memorial of the Scottish Congregational Churches. Edinburgh and London: Fullarton and Co.

THE occasion of this publication is sufficiently indicated by its title. The principal part of its contents is historical, including sketches of the religious condition of Scotland, previous to the rise of modern Independency, of the circumstances connected with the origin of the present Congregational body, of their position and prospects. Dr. Wardlaw contributes a discourse on 'The First Love Left,' and a semi-historical essay on 'Purity of Fellowship as Distinctive of Congregationalism,' both marked by his chaste elegance. Dr. Alexander gives a sermon on the 'Work of the Churches, and their Means of Performing it.' It would be impossible to characterise, as a whole, a volume made up by so many hands—and it is unnecessary to deal with the separate parts in detail. The impression that is left on us is rather one with regard to Scottish Congregationalists than with regard to the book itself. It sets before us a body of strong principled Christian men, whose numerical weakness tends to diminish their self-complacency, and increase their sturdy adherence to the truth; there is no boasting, no numbering of the people, no skirting from a fair estimate of the difficulties of their position, but grave thankfulness for past progress, and strong determination to future faithfulness. We rejoice in their continued existence at a time when circumstances have powerfully aided the hereditary national predilections for a more complicated ecclesiastical gear, and welcome this volume as a valuable memorial of some of the most interesting passages in modern religious history.

Revelations of Ireland in the Past Generation. By D. Owen Madden. Dublin: James McGlashan.

MR. MADDEN's preface tells us that this volume consists of some of the more amusing and less dignified materials which he has collected for a forthcoming history of Ireland since the Union. A selection, he calls it, but we confess that we do not see much evidence of any selecting principle. This, however, is but a small matter in a volume making no pretensions to being orderly, and in which the point in hand is generally so well told, that it leaves us without any wish to find out precisely what we have to thank for the introduction of another good story. The author is thoroughly at home in the Irish society of the early part of the present century, and has furnished us in this volume with a mass of graphic illustrations of the actual condition of the country at that period. We presume that the history, for which these materials are too light, will be a very dignified and proper affair, presenting us with generalizations from the facts that we have here; but we fancy the author is in his vocation in this volume, and should leave the history to others. At all events we should be glad of another volume of the same kind, and can promise any of our readers who like books with plenty of gossip, wit, narratives, just system enough to admit of a division into chapters, and not enough to demand the exercise of their thinking faculties, that they will find in this volume the very one which they can lie on a sofa and read without feeling that they are wasting time.

Evangelical Melodies. London : Dalton.

WE are sorry to have to condemn, without mitigation, a work of which the good intention is undeniable. But correct taste, no less than fitting reverence for religion, must be—we had almost said disgusted—with a volume where 'Moore's Melodies' are parodied in evangelical strains, of which the following, from the caricature of 'When in death I am calm reclining,' may do for a sample :—

' If a stone on my grave reposes,
I pray you upon its surface write,
That he, the mouth of whose grave it closes,
Held free-grace principles, main and might.'

What do our readers think of,

' There is not in the world a season more sweet,
Than is that when the Lord in the closet we meet ;'

or of ' Fly to the gospel—fly with me,' ' The Christian's Tear,' ' One Embrace at Parting,' addressed to Nonconformist brethren? The absurd contrast between the familiar strains of the original and the doggrel (as the author with rare self-knowledge almost confesses), of this volume, create associations anything but favourable to devout feeling in a Christian, and sure to be productive either of laughter or contempt in others. We know but one class who can find anything for themselves here—those who think that poetry and music are snares of Satan. Not believing this, we can only regret, for the sake of that religion which wages no war against these gifts of the Divine hand, that exquisite songs have been turned into execrable productions, evangelical it may be, but assuredly not melodies.

Memoir of the Rev. Henry Duncan, D.D. By Rev. G. J. Duncan.
Edinburgh : Oliphant and Sons.

THE character of Dr. Duncan is sufficiently sketched by saying that he was at once the author of 'The Sacred Philosophy of the Seasons,' the founder of Savings' Banks, and the faithful minister of Christ,—the man of taste, the man of business, the man of prayer. The points of interest in such a life are well brought out in this volume, the work of his son. It is an admirable narrative, in which the author's relationship to the subject gives a certain domestic charm to the whole, while it does not lead to the indiscriminate eulogy so common when filial affection guides the pen, but so offensive.

Life of the Rev. John McDonald, A.M., late Missionary Minister from the Free Church of Scotland at Calcutta. By Rev. W. K. Tweedie.
Edinburgh : Johnstone.

THIS is a very interesting memorial of the life of a man whose whole course was marked by unflagging energy and firmness—high qualities, which found their root in constant intimate communion with God. This gave humility before Him, and that made boldness before all others. The great charm of the volume is the way in which the con-

nexion between the deep contrite devotion of his privacy and the qualities of his public life is exhibited, by means of extracts from his confidential diaries and letters—a kind of reading we can seldom tolerate, but which, in the present volume, is given in a way that goes far to remove the objections usually attaching to a disclosure of the secret thoughts of the dead, even when the object is to teach the living.

The Young Man's Aid to Improvement, Success, and True Happiness.
By Mentor. Glasgow: Gallie.

A VOLUME of very good advice, but rather too old-womanish. 'In most part the materials are drawn from a work by the Rev. H. Winslow, Pastor of Bewdoin-street Church, Boston.'

Six Letters on Dr. Todd's Discourses on the Prophecies relating to Anti-christ in the Apocalypse. By E. B. Denison, M.A. London: Painter, 1848.

No one will deny to Mr. Denison great acuteness and dexterity in the management of his arguments. He writes with much vigour in opposition to Dr. Todd's notions of interpretation, and would have written with greater effect for serious inquirers had his acuteness less frequently degenerated into flippancy, and his vigour into coarseness.

Ruins of Many Lands. By Nicholas Michell. London: Tegg.
Parts I. and II.

THIS poetry strikes us as having come into the world at the wrong time. In subject—the ruins scattered over the world, and the moralizing they give rise to, in measure—the uniform heroic couplet, in style—polished and antithetical, it belongs to the last century. It has many merits, and there is all the apparatus of poetry, well-balanced lines, plenty of apostrophes and 'Come thou's,' abundant personifications, capital letters, and epithets, but there is not, to our perception, the one thing needful—the poetic fire. Without it, all the author's efforts and preparations are like those of the old heathen priests to bring down the divine flame—and, alas! with the same result—'there was no voice, nor answer.'

Trafford, the Reward of Genius: and other Poems. By James Innes Minchin. London: Smith, Elder, and Co.

THIS volume deserves a word of cordial welcome. The author is a man of genuine poetic sensibility. Contemplative and tender, he loves chiefly to dwell on the quietly beautiful. He is more at home in dealing with the calm, tranquil flow of the emotions, than with their rapids and whirlpools. There is a touch of Tennyson in his love for repose; and in his somewhat weary (we do not mean wearisome), way of talk-

ing of life and effort, but he is by no means a mere imitator. The volume, if it have not all the higher qualities of poetry, is full of marks that, what the author says in his preface is true, 'I have written poetry because I felt it ;' and we hope this is not the last of his writing.

The Pulpit Orators of France and Switzerland: Sketches of their Character, and Specimens of their Eloquence. By the Rev. Robert Turnbull. Glasgow and London: Collins.

THE preachers who find a place in this volume are Bossuet, Flechier, Bourdaloue, Fenelon, Massillon, Saurin, Vinet, Monod, Grandpierre, Lacordaire, Merle D'Aubigne, and Gausseen. The biographical sketches and criticisms are interesting and discriminating, while the sermons selected are carefully translated. Mr. Turnbull has succeeded well in reproducing the peculiarities of thought and expression of each author. His work is an acceptable contribution to our knowledge of a style of pulpit address, marked by many peculiarities, and not a few excellences. It forms one of Mr. Collins's valuable cheap series.

The Juvenile Scrap-Book: A Gage d'Amour for the Young. Edited by Mrs. Milner. 1850. London: Peter Jackson.

THE general character of this volume is like that of its predecessors. It unites the gay and the grave in happy proportion, and is felicitously adapted to instruct, as well as to attract and please, the juvenile reader. The change in its editorship has induced no alteration in its object. It is still what 'The Juvenile Scrap-Book' has ever been, a joyous and informing companion, which may be admitted to the family circle without danger to the moral health of its young members. The preface, which is dated from 'The Vicarage, Appleby,' expresses the hope of the editor that 'the whole tone and bearing of the work will be found to be in accordance with the spirit of Christianity, and to be calculated to promote the improvement, while it administers to the amusement, of those into whose hands it may fall.' The engravings are of a superior order, and we cordially commend the volume to the favour of our young friends.

Fireside Tales for the Young. By Mrs. Ellis. Vols. II. and III. London: Peter Jackson.

THE first volume of this work was published last year, and was noticed in our journal for December, 1848. It consists of a selection of the best tales which have appeared in the 'Juvenile Scrap-Book,' while that annual was under the editorship of Mrs. Ellis. We are glad that the selection has been continued, and know of few works which are more likely to please the class for which it is designed. The title is as appropriate as it is attractive, and the whole 'getting up' of the volumes is as pleasing as their contents are instructive. Few writers possess, in so happy a degree as Mrs. Ellis, the faculty of gratifying

the imagination, while the taste is corrected, and the moral principles confirmed. The vein of sentiment which runs throughout her productions, is real and healthy, free from whatever is morbid, yet sufficiently impregnated with the bright hues of imagination to sustain the attention and minister to the pleasure of the young.

Sir Aymer; a Poem, in Four Cantos. London: Longman and Co.

WE are very willing to admit that 'Sir Aymer' has many descriptive passages of considerable beauty, that the versification is smooth, and that the paper and print are luxurious, but we cannot bring ourselves to accept the title-page, short as it is, as correct. A poem it certainly is not. It is a tale of a deeply-injured man, who vows revenge on the authors of his misfortunes, but, by the force of circumstances, is made to return good for evil; in the process his bitter feelings change, and having benefitted them all, he betakes himself to Palestine, to do heroic deeds. There is the usual allowance of black armour and cloisters, hermits' cells, tournaments, robbers, and wounded knights, and so forth; there are four cantos, and eighteen hundred lines, two or three pleasing descriptions, some forcible passages, and a great deal which no mortal man will ever remember an hour after he has read it.

The Leader of the Lollards, his Times and Trials; with a Glance at our own Age. By Rev. A. Morton Brown, M.A. London: Partridge and Oakey.

THE life of Lord Cobham is here simply told—and the epoch in which he lived paralleled with our own. Mr. Brown finds in the increase of Popery the crying danger of the times, and urges Protestants to a higher standard of piety, more evangelism, more care for the young, and more union, as the great protections against its efforts. For the rest the first sentence of the preface will sufficiently explain the character of the book—'the following pages offer no pretensions to originality, but aim throughout at usefulness.' The author has realized both parts of his ideal.

Addresses to Children, with Introductory Observations to Ministers and Teachers. By Samuel G. Green, B.A. London: B. L. Green.

WE have great pleasure in recommending this little volume. It is simple, without being so condescendingly childish as most children's books are. There is no overstrained plainness, which as often disgusts as pleases the little critics for whom it is adopted. Easy, natural, perfectly intelligible, it has a charm for all; and children of full age, reviewers included, will read it with pleasure.

A Selection from the Correspondence of the late Rev. J. T. Nottidge, M.A., &c. Edited by the Rev. C. Bridges, M.A. London: Seeleys.

MR. NOTTIDGE, for many years an estimable minister of the English Church, seems to have been a man of kindly disposition, and of deep

piety, which long bodily suffering rendered somewhat morbid. His letters have all the marks of coming from a habitually devout man, whom patient, penitent study of his own heart, peculiarly fitted to counsel others. Many sorrows made him a tender comforter. They are a valuable addition to the class of Christian literature to which they belong—the practical, contemplative books that men read when they are alone and would be near God.

Remarkable and Eccentric Characters: with Illustrations. By F. W. Fairholt, F.S.A. Vol. I. London: Bentley's Cabinet Library.

THIS seems a rather trashy collection of the old stories about misers and dwarfs. It is certainly compiled with care—and to people who like to look at monsters may serve to occupy half an hour—but that is all we can say for it.

The White Slave; a Life of John Newton. Written for Young Children.
By G. E. Sargent. London: Benjamin L. Green.

A VERY simple narrative of a life peculiarly adapted to interest children. A better selection of a subject could scarcely have been made than the adventurous career of Newton. The book is an admirable one.

Recreations, Physical and Mental, Lawful and Unlawful. A Lecture.
By Thomas Aveling. London: Snow.

MR. AVELING is of opinion that 'increasingly worldly notions concerning recreations are prevalent among professing Christians,' and therefore presents this lecture as his contribution towards the discussion of the subject. His plan is to take up, in order, the various classes of amusements, and decide whether they are lawful or unlawful—but we do not find any clear exposition of the general ethics of the subject. In his conclusions, most Christians will concur.

The Protestant Dissenter's Almanack for 1850. London: John Snow.
The Dissenter's Penny Almanack for 1850. London: John Snow.

THESE are very useful publications, occupying a department of their own, and being entitled to all the patronage they solicit. In addition to the ordinary matter supplied in Almanacks, they contain a large mass of important and interesting information respecting the machinery and working of the State-Church, and the various religious enterprises which characterise and do honour to our day. The former is sold at threepence, and the latter at one penny, and we know not where better or cheaper articles of the kind can be purchased. The papers, though brief, are in many cases very excellent, and may be read with great advantage. We may specify as examples the 'Ecclesiastical History of a Life,' and 'The Substitution of Ritual for Spiritual Religion Effected by a State Church.'

To the Editor of the Eclectic Review.

[We readily give insertion to the following letter, which we have received from our esteemed friend, Dr. Harris. It has been our invariable practice, whenever a gentleman has deemed himself misrepresented in our pages to allow him the opportunity of setting himself right with our readers. This is a simple act of justice which we have never refused, and which we accord with special pleasure in the case of one, for whom a long-cherished and ever-growing esteem is blended with the sincerest admiration, and a grateful estimate of the high value of the service he is rendering to theological science. Nothing certainly was further from our intention than to misstate his views; and if the following letter serve to prevent misapprehension on the part of our readers, we shall rejoice in the fact equally with its writer.—*Ed.*]

DEAR SIR,—Allow me the liberty of remarking on two or three of the apparent misconceptions in the review of 'Man Primeval,' in last month's 'Eclectic.' I will be as brief as possible.

1. The reviewer states respecting 'the laws laid down as elements of the author's scheme, that *some* of them are not *obviously necessary*;' and 'thinks he perceives, that the author is now beginning to show the *logical inconvenience* of assuming *some* of them.' On which I have to remark, first, that the reviewer, in saying that *some* of them are not obviously necessary, implies his readiness to admit that others of them are necessary. Secondly, that I myself have not said more than this—have nowhere affirmed that they are *all* metaphysically necessary. I am quite content with showing that they are all *true*. The reviewer, therefore, is here gravely denying that which I have never thought of affirming. And, thirdly, that the time for me to feel the *logical inconvenience* to which the reviewer alludes, would have been, in my previous volume, when I was deducing the principles which appeared *reasonable*, from those which appeared *necessary*. In every subsequent stage, I have only had to do with *facts*; that is, I have had to test and to verify those principles by an appeal to the actual phenomena of creation. And I can assure the reviewer that, in doing this, the only inconvenience which I have hitherto felt has arisen from the superabundant and diversified character of the facts offering themselves in illustration.

2. The reviewer proceeds to say, in relation to this supposed inconvenience, 'we are now thinking particularly of the general principles—1, that in all the manifestations of the Divine perfections, there is to be the development of some perfection not previously manifested at all;—and, 2, that there is also to be the carrying forward of the past into the future. It struck us, at the time when these principles were enunciated in the first volume, that there might occur some stage in the course of the Divine manifestation in which the *first* of these principles would be seen to be too partial to be held as a constant principle; and in which the *second* would be seen to be limited by another principle more comprehensive than itself. It further appeared to us, that the writer himself was aware of this probability, especially in relation to the second of these principles; for we find, in his mode of expressing the law, a *proviso*, as it seemed, for such a possible occurrence: the

proviso being expressed in these words :—“ all that is characteristic in the lower steps of the process should be carried up into the higher—*as far as it may subserve the great end ; or unless it should be superseded by something analogous and superior in the higher, and the future.*” As to the first of the principles adverted to, I might limit myself to saying that it is no principle of mine. If the reviewer will do me the justice to refer to my own statement of the law in question, he will find it to stand thus :—‘ That every Divinely-originated object and event is a result of which the supreme and ultimate reason is in the Divine Nature.’ The ‘ object or event’ may bring to light a new *perfection* of the blessed God, or only a new *aspect*, or a *further development*, of a perfection already known. I have never thought of affirming that it must be, of necessity, the display of ‘ a perfection not previously manifested at all.’ Even if I had so affirmed, indeed, I might have replied, first, that as far as I have yet gone I have made good the proposition—a fact which the reviewer himself admits; secondly, that his apprehended failure of the supposed law, therefore, relates to a stage of the Divine manifestation of which I have not yet treated, and, as such, is a prejudgment of a yet unpublished treatise; and, thirdly, that if I had stated the law as the reviewer represents, I must have meant that as a new perfection of God had characterised each preceding stage of the Divine procedure, so *mercy* would be found to mark the *human* dispensation taken as a whole; and I know not that such a proposition would have admitted of dispute.

3. The reviewer appears to think that the second law will be found to be retainable only as it is limited by the proviso which he represents it as containing; and adds, ‘ the pressure of a difficulty which this *proviso* seems, in some measure, to relieve, is felt, the moment we come to those manifestations of the Divine perfections, which are actually *consequent* upon the probation and the apostasy of man.’ Here, again, I have, first, to call attention to the important fact—important, that is, to the book under review—that the reviewer’s apprehensions are prospective, relating to ground which I have not yet occupied. Secondly, that what the reviewer calls ‘ a proviso,’ or a limitation of the law, is, in truth, the law itself—the latter part being simply an explanation of the former part. And, thirdly and chiefly, that such a law, instead of being intended by me as a mere forecasting provision against certain possible occurrences, was meant to be regarded as a strict transcript of objective reality—creation itself being a system of relations and limitations. As such, I believe I have verified the law *hitherto* (the reviewer himself implies this); and, if I mistake not, I shall hereafter be able to show that it is not less applicable to the next stage of the Divine procedure than to the preceding.

4. The reviewer says, ‘ Dr. Harris seems to include the apostasy of man within the *natural* law of change.’ I can assure him that I never meant to convey such an impression. On the contrary, the law under which I include it is one to which I believe all the natural laws themselves are subject. I have thus expressed it : ‘ That the law of ever-enlarging manifestation be itself regulated by a law determining the time for each successive stage and addition in the great process.’* I have

* Pre-Adamite Earth, p. 66.

then proceeded to state that the *time* for the change in any given department of the Divine manifestation, will of course be determined in a *manner*, and for a *reason*, differing according to the particular *nature and design* of the department. And, in applying this law to man's probation, I have shown that it could include him, as a free being, only in a manner consonant with his freedom : a manner, therefore, unique, and essentially inapplicable to the inclusion of any mere *natural* laws.

Two or three other points of the review admit of remark ; but I am unwilling to trespass on your valuable pages. All that is courteous and commendatory in the review is the more highly valued by me as it is evidently accorded by one who has aimed at impartiality.

JOHN HARRIS.

Cheshunt College, Nov. 8, 1849.

Literary Intelligence.

Just Published.

Shirley ; a Tale. By Currer Bell, Author of 'Jane Eyre.' Three Vols. The Life and Correspondence of the late Robert Southey. Edited by his Son, the Rev. Charles Cuthbert Southey. Vol. I.

Con Cregan, the Irish Gil Blas. No. XI.

Protestant Dissenter's Almanack for 1850.

The Dissenter's Penny Almanack for 1850.

The Financial Reform Almanack for 1850.

Development of Difference the Basis of Unity ; Introductory Lecture to the Courses of the Faculty of Arts and Laws, delivered in University College, London, Oct. 16, 1849. By Alex. W. Williamson, Ph.D.

Prelections on Butler's Analogy, Paley's Evidences of Christianity, and Hill's Lectures in Divinity ; with Two Introductory Lectures, and Four Addresses, delivered in the New College, Edinburgh. By the late Thomas Chalmers, D.D.

Christ's Second Coming ; Will it be pre-Millenial ? By Rev. David Brown, A.M., St. James's Free Church, Glasgow.

History of England during the Thirty Years' Peace. Part IX.

The National Cyclopædia of Useful Knowledge. Part XXXIV.

The Sabbath of Heaven ; a Sermon, delivered in Albion Chapel, Hull, on Sunday, September 23, 1849, during the prevalence of Cholera, and published by request. By Rev. O. T. Dobbin, LL.D., Trinity Col. Dublin.

A Memorial concerning Personal and Family Fasting and Humiliation. By the late Rev. Thos. Boston, Minister of the Gospel at Ettrick. With Prefatory Remarks and Appendix. By Rev. Alexander Moody Stuart, A.M. Third Edition.

Apostolical Sketches ; or, some incidents in the Lives of the First Teachers considered. By the Rev. Thomas Sworde, A.M., Rector of St. Peter's, Thetford.

Religious Teachings ; being Sermons preached on various occasions, and Short Addresses to Boys at a Public School. By Rev. H. Highton, M.A., Assistant Master of Rugby School.

Panthea ; the Spirit of Nature. By Robert Hunt.

A Memorandum of the Wonderful Providences of God to a poor unworthy Creature, during the time of the Duke of Monmouth's Rebellion, and to the Revolution of 1688. By John Coad, one of the Sufferers.

INDEX.

VOL. XXVI. NEW SERIES.

Aldis, J., *The Excellent Glory*, 390.
Angas, G. F., *The Kaffirs illustrated*, 423; *Scenery of South Africa*, 424.
Arbitration Treaties instead of War, 236; not impracticable, 239; opinion of Buonaparte, 246; progress of the question, 247; its prospects, 250.
Auerbach, B., *Events in Vienna*, 364; real power of Austria broken, 376.
Aveling, T., *Recreations, Physical and Mental*, 773.
Barossa Range, The, 423, 427.
Bass Rock, The, 226; its martyrology—Alex. Peden, 229, Fraser, 231, Dickson, 233.
Bell, Currer; *Shirley*, 739; characterised, 748; outline of the story, 741—748.
Bell, R., *Fairfax Correspondence*, 62; conduct of Fairfax at trial of Charles I., 72; his character, 71; treachery of Monk, 74.
Binney, T., *On the Christian Ministry*, 387.
Bible of Every Land, The, 387.
Birch, W. J., *Philosophy and Religion of Shakspere*, 253.
Bivort, M. J. B., *Electoral Laws of Belgium*, 254.
Boys, T., *A Word for the Church*, 649, 652; his views ill-defined, 653; affirms the actual identity of Church and State, 655.
Bridges, C., *Correspondence of J. T. Nottidge*, 772.
Brodie, J., *Memoir of Annie McD. Christie*, 517.

VOL. XXVI.

Brewer, Dr., *Guide to Scientific Knowledge of Things familiar*, 391.

Brodie, R., *Discourses, Doctrinal and Practical*, 388.

Brown, A. M., *The Leader of the Lollards*, 772.

Browning, R., *Poems by*, 203; poets for the many, 205, and for the few, 206; author's neglect of incident, 208; strength of association and imagination, 209; subtlety of thought, *ib.*; Sordello, 210; Pippa Passes, 212.

Burchell, Thomas, *Memoirs of*, 127, 159; his early history, 162; arrival in Jamaica, 165; testimony to persecution of the converts, 169; against slavery, 170; arrest, 173; attempt on his life, 174, 175; compelled to quit the colony, 176.

Burgess, H., *Eminent Personal Religion the Want of the Times*, 517.

Burton, J. H., *Political and Social Economy*, 519.

Calcott, M. H., *Home among Strangers*, 389.

Carey, H. C., *Past, Present, and Future*, 148; refutation of Ricardo and Malthus, 151; advocacy of legislative protection, 156.

Chateaubriand's *Mémoires*, 275; his grandmother, 278; mode of life of his father's family, 280; noblesse of Brittany, 284; visit to America, 286; corruption of French functionaries, 288.

Conder, Josiah, *Harmony of History with Prophecy*, 766.

Cumming, J., *Christ receiving Sinners*, 391.

Danson, J. T., *Condition of the People in relation to the price of Food*, 395, 413; marriage limited by dear food, 395, 399; and crime increased, 401, 404; invariably, 405; connexion of morals with physical well-being, 407, 412.

Death, Punishment of, Debate on, 98; not necessary, 102; nor operative as a restraint, 103, 107; positively injurious, 108; leaves no room for reformation, 119; theology, 110; and statistics of the question, 113; man not authorized to kill on the ground of desert, 116; summary of argument, 120.

Denham, J., *Marriage with a deceased wife's sister not forbidden*, 521—540.

Denison, E. B., *Letters on Dr. Todd's Discourses of Antichrist*, 770.

Dick, Thomas, *Atmosphere, and Atmospheric Phenomena*, 253.

Discipline, 647.

Dissenter's Penny Almanack, 773.

Dixon, H., *John Howard*, 541; his youth, 544; capture by the French, 545; conditions before marriage, 546; life at Cardington, 547; death of his wife, 549; chosen sheriff, 550; state of English prisons, 551; continental tour, 556; *the knout in Russia*, 561; researches into the nature of the plague, 562; return to England, 566; death at Cherson, 567.

Dodson, Rev. I., *Brief Reasons for leaving the English Establishment*, 1; their sincerity, 2; and logical power, 3; *Mr. D.'s secession one of the first fruits of B. Noel's Essay*, 5; his sacrifices, 12; burden of subscription, 7; unscriptural tenets of the Establishment, 8, 10; supremacy of the State, 11; progress of the Anti-state-church Association, 14; protest against Regium Donum, 16; petitions to parliament, 19; argument about spiritual declension, 20.

Drummond, D. T. K., *Memoirs of Montague Stanley*, 129; influence of the stage adverse to morality, 130, 139; exemplified in Stanley's life, 140; his success as an actor, 142; conversion, 144; retirement, 145; and death, 148.

Duncan, Dr. Henry, *Memoir of*, 769.

Eadie, J., *Inspiration in conflict with recent forms of Philosophy*, 645.

Ellis, Mrs., *Fireside Tales for the Young*, 771.

Erasmus, D., *Pilgrimages to Walsingham and Canterbury*, 645.

Ernesto di Ripalta, 517.

Etty, W., *Autobiography and Catalogue of Works*, 324; morality of paintings of the nude, 327; pre-eminence in colour, 328; his designing full of knowledge, 329; epochs of his works, 330; special merits of his chief pictures, 331—337; landscapes, 337; not original in subject, *ib.*

Evangelical Melodies, 769.

Fairbairn, P., *Topology of Scripture*, 194; its character, 203; use and abuse of types, 196; import of the Mosaic sacrifices, 200; answer to rationalistic objections, 201.

Fairholt, F. W., *Remarkable and Eccentric Characters*, 773.

Farquhar, D., *The Torch of Time*, 514.

Ferguson, W., *Impending Dangers of our Country*, 646.

Financial Reform Almanack, 765.

Fisher's Drawing-Room Scrap Book for 1850, 643.

Foster, J. K., *Conversations on British Church History*, 389.

Foster, Mrs., *Hand-Book of Modern European Literature*, 387.

France and her Religious History, 518.

Francis, J., *Chronicles and Characters of the Stock Exchange*, 717; its design, 718; tulip-mania, 720; political hoaxes, 721; *Wilkes and the Jew Broker*, 722; State lotteries, 723; subsidies of Pitt, 724; *Mark Sprot*, *ib.*; David Ricardo, 725; Thomas Gray, 726; Rothschild, 727; caution with regard to life assurance companies, 729.

Fraser, R. W., *Moriah*, 388.

Freehold Land Societies, 176; their principle, 178; success, 180; effects, 181.

Giles, J. E., *Popery a System of Priestly Power*, 388.

Gillmor, C., *Reply to B. W. Noel's Essay on Union of Church and State*, 649; a tirade not an answer, 652.

Gorham, G. C., *Examination by Bishop of Exeter*, 478; judgment of the Court of Arches, 479; anomaly of a laic being judge, 481; different senses put upon the baptismal formulary, 485; theory of Mr. Gorham, 487; is it in the Prayer-book? 491; objections to it, 494.

Green, S. G., *Addresses to Children*, 772.

Guerrazzi, F. D., *Memoirs of*, 22; early history, 24; ambition, 26; politically persecuted, 29—33; publishes the Siege of Florence, 35; made Prime Minister of Tuscany, *ib.*

Hagenbach, K. R., *History of Doctrines*, 428; period of systematic theology, 429; scholasticism, 431; mysticism, 433; political and ecclesiastical symbolism, 436; principles of Protestantism, 437; period of speculation, 440; philosophizings of the present day, 442, 446; proper limits of speculation, 443; supreme authority of revelation, 447.

Haller, — *The Moderate Monarchy*, 515.

Hare, G. C., *Sermons in Herstmonceaux Church*, 124.

Harris, Dr. J., *Man Primeval*, 612; outline of the argument, 613—617; the idea of God, how obtained, 619; destiny of man not discoverable by philosophy, 622; strictures on the work, 623; *Letter from Author*, 774.

Hayward, A., *Remarks on Law of Marriage*, 521; its frequent alterations, 536.

Head, Sir G., *Rome*, 214; more sympathy due to men than to their works, 217; *Roman wood-cutters*, 217; *pigs*, 219; *horse-race*, 221; *carnival*, 223.

Heaton, G., *On the Punishment of Death*, 98, 111.

Hereditary Legislation, 626; its folly, 627; the real power with the House of Commons, 628; Lord Brougham, 631, as the orator en- raged, 635, 639; how the House of Lords deals with foreign policy, 630; and colonial, 632; specimens of its much-ado-about-nothing, 634—640.

Herschel, Sir J. W., *Outlines of Astronomy*, 576; physical constitution of the sun, 580; of the moon, 582; comets, 584; *singularities of Halley's*, 588; of Biela's, 591; distance of stars, 592; double stars, 593; nebulae, 594.

Hinton, J. H., *Athanasia*, 338; impugners of man's natural adaptation to immortality confound the physical and spiritual, 342; *definition of life and death*, 344; duration of future punishment, 346; what its deniers have to prove, 347.

Holmes, R., *Case of Ireland Stated*, 759; capital wanted, 762; abolition of privileges of landed proprietorship, 763; tenant-right of Ulster, *ib.*; relief fund of Society of Friends, 759.

Hope, A. J., *On Marriage Law*, 521; flippant and blundering, 539.

Humboldt, A. Von, *Aspects of Nature*, 643.

Hunt, R., *Poetry of Science*, 36; its character, 55; title inapplicable, 38; *discovery of Neptune*, 40; phenomena of heat, 42; *spheroidal condition of bodies*, *ib.*; *light*, 44; *animal electricity*, 46; magnetic forces, 48; *mutual dependence of plants and animals*, 49; *chemical elements*, 52; agreement of revelation and true science, 54.

Ireland, — *Rizzio*, 125.

Jubilee Memorial of Scottish Congregational Churches, 768.

Jury, Trial by, 749; class from which taken, 751; well qualified to judge of facts, 752; and to secure the rights of the people, 753; the institution therefore neither unnecessary nor mischievous, 755; but the verdict should be by a majority, 756; question of Grand Juries, 757; and country justices, 758.

Juvenile Scrap Book, 771.

Keble, J., *Profane dealing with Holy*

Matrimony, 521; examined, 532; uncandid and evasive, 540.

Lyell, Sir C., *Second Visit to United States*, 349; American railways, 352; power of religion apart from the State, *ib.*; newspapers, 354; social equality, 356; American Unitarianism, 357; Slavery, 358; *capabilities of the negro*, 360; *habits of the alligator*, 361; *planters of French extraction*, 362.

Liber Ecclesiasticus, 257; its origin, 261; discrepancy between it and tithe returns, 263; true amount of property held by clergy, 266, 269; Fees and Easter Offerings, 268; parsonages and glebe lands, 269; freeschool masterships, 270; Church rates, 272; present condition of the Establishment, 273.

Lincoln, Mr. and Mrs., Memoirs of, 388.

Literary Intelligence, 127, 255, 386, 519, 647, 776.

Long, Mrs. E., Memoir of, 390.

Longfellow, H. W., *Poems*, 78; *Evangeline*, 79; *Psalm of Life*, 80.

Lowe, T., *On the Punishment of Death for Murder*, 98, 111.

Lytton, Sir E. B., *King Arthur*, 449; its satirical parts, 451; outline of the story, 454—456; *final harangue of Merlin*, 459; author's characteristics as a poet, 458.

McCabe, W. B., *A Catholic History of England*, 683; Danish invasions, 684; Anglo-Saxon Literature, 687; Romanist miracles, 688, 691; *the monks held in contempt in the reign of Alfred*, 690; condition of Anglo-Saxon Church in the tenth century, 693.

McDonald, J., *Memoir and Manuscript of Isabel Hood*, 517.

McKillop, H. F., *Service in New Zealand*, 414.

Madden, D. O., *Revelations of Ireland*, 768.

Marheincke, P. H., *History of the German Reformation*, 694; corruptions of the Papacy, 697; testifyers to Italian, 698, German, 699; sale of indulgences, 701; Tetzel, 704; Luther, 705; his character as a reformer, 707, controversialist,

708, translator, 709, preacher, 710, influence on language and literature, 711; Ulrich von Hutten, 713; charges against the Reformation answered, 715.

Marriage, Report on Law of, 521; history of the prohibitory law, 522; that act a failure, 526; its demoralizing tendency, 527; Levitical laws not binding, 530; how interpreted by the Jews, 532; not an ecclesiastical question, 533; but one of expediency, 535.

Marsh, T., *Apology for the Church of England in Connexion with the State*, 649; characterised, 664; the powers that be have no plenary authority from God, 656; the Jewish theocracy no rule for us, 657; Christian rulers and nations not bound to serve God officially, 659; State not competent to judge of truth, 660; feebleness of author's argument for Church rates, 661; illogical defence of Prayer-book Services, 663.

Menzel, W., *History of Germany*, 644.

Merryweather, F. S., *Bibliomania in the Middle Ages*, 519.

Michell, Nicholas, *Ruins of Many Lands*, 770.

Minchin, J. J., *Trafford, &c.*, 770.

Morley, H., *Sunrise in Italy*, 767.

National Cyclopædia of Useful Knowledge, 646.

Nitsch, C. J., *System of Christian Doctrine*, 731; mangled and misrepresented by R. Montgomery and J. Hennen, 732—739.

Noel, B. W., *Essay on the Union of Church and State*, 650, 664; professed replies to, 649.

North British Review, The, 652; Free-church theory of Establishments, 658; its fallacy, 650.

Pellatt, A., *Curiosities of Glass-making*, 289; invention of glass, 290; Roman manufacture, 292; Chinese, 293; Venetian, 294; English, 293, 299; *setting a pot*, 299; *annealing*, 300; *Venetian balls*, 302; *Bohemian*, 303; *incrustation*, 304.

Polyglot Bible, the English version of, 262.

Protestant Dissenter's Almanack, 773.
 Power, W. T., *Sketches in New Zealand*, 414; scenery, 418; value of the colony, 422.
 Pridham, C., *Account of Ceylon*, 183; its climate, 185; scenery, 186, 189; productions, 187; inhabitants, 190; value, 193.
 Pusey, E. B., *On Change in the Laws of Marriage*, 521; *Marriage with a wife's sister prohibited*, 521, 533; very acrimonious, 529; narrow and uncandid, 540.
 Quinton, J. A., *Heaven's Antidote to the Curse of Labour*, 514.
 Redhead, T. W., *History of French Revolutions from 1789 to 1848*, 127.
Reformer's Almanack, 765.
 Registrar-General, *Ninth Annual Report* of the, 395; proof that marriages vary with the price of food, 395, 399, 413.
 Rich, A. J., *Illustrated Companion to Latin and Greek Dictionary*, 126.
 Rowton, R. J., *Capital Punishment for Murder Scriptural*, 460; argument from the Mosaic law, 465; proves too much, 466; Genesis ix. 6, 468; Romans xiii. 3 and 4, 470; case of Cain, 474; the New Testament law, 475; historical argument, 477.
Sabbath Prize Essays by Working Men, 514.
 Sargent, G. E., *The White Slave*, 773.
 Sedgwick, J., *History of France to 1840*, 390.
 Scott, Hugh, *Scottish Nationality*, 516.
Sir Aymer, a Poem, 772.
 Smith, G., *Hints for the Times*, 388.
 Smith, J., *Our Scottish Clergy*, 515.
 Smith, Dr. J. P., *Scripture Testimony to the Mesiah*, 305; certain redundancies and blemishes, 311.
Social Sciences, Introduction to Study of, 518.
 Southey, R., *Common-Place Book*, 124.
 Stephen, Sir J., *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography*, 123.
 Stowell, W. H., *The Work of the Holy Spirit*, 665; the *Congregational Lectures*, as a series, 666; present state of the question of Christian evidences, 668; disposition to depreciate doctrinal opinion, 670; and see nothing special in the Gospel, 669; plan of the volume, 671 672; man's spiritual capacities, state, and wants, 673; *predisposition to evil*, 674; *conditions of divine agency in regeneration*, 675; work of the Spirit in saving man, 677, quite independent of Church ordinances, 678; its mystery, 680, 682.
 Sturt, C., *Expedition into Central Australia*, 599; the Depôt, 603; native dwellings, 602; and character, 606, 610; theory of an inland sea, 607.
Συγγίνεια, Appeal on the Law of Marriage, 540.
 Taylor, Isaac, *Loyola and Jesuitism*, 84; the crisis of his history, 87; *his conversion consummated*, 90; assisted in framing his code, 93; author's *estimate of the Spiritual Exercises*, 95; protest against some of his views, 87, 88, 94, 97.
 Teleki, L., *Cause of Hungary Stated*, 364; treachery of the Austrian Court, 368; *Hungarian parties*, 371; charter octroyée, 373; sketch of the war, 375; constitutional law entirely in favour of the patriots, 378; claim of Hungary to be recognised as independent, 380; pretexts for Russian intervention refuted, 382; abolition of feudal claims, 383.
 Thirlwall, C., *History of Greece*, 251.
 Thom, D., *Number and Name of the Apocalyptic Beasts*, 568.
Tithe Commutation Returns, 257, 260; differ from other clerical statements, 263.
 Tregelles, S. P., *Book of the Revelation*, 389.
 Tuckerman, Joseph, *Memoir of*, 254.
 Turnbull, D., *Pulpit Orators of France and Switzerland*, 771.
 Tweedy, W. K., *Life of John McDonald*, 769.
Unveiling of the Everlasting Gospel, 391.

Vlieland, J. N., *Method of learning French*, 391.

Warburton, E., *Memoirs of Prince Rupert*, 62; its puerilities, 63; *Edgehill fight*, 68; Character of Charles I., 66; of *Rupert*, 77.

Werne, F., *Expedition to the White Nile*, 313; Kartum, 317; slavery, 319; *The Keks*, 320; outrage upon the natives, 322.

Whiteside, J., *Italy in the 19th century*, 495, 496; *Vicissitudes of the Eternal City*, *ib.*; innate vices, 498, and tyranny of the Papacy, 500; Roman republic, 502; the French expedition, 503, a gross infraction of the law of nations, 506; President's letter, 511; the Triumvirate, 508; Lord Brougham's calumnies, 509; blunders of the Whigs, 512.

Woodcock, W. J., *Scripture Lands*, 516.

Wortley, Stuart, *Speech on law of Marriage*, 521, 524.

Younger, J., *The Light of the Week*, 514.

Young Man's Aid to Improvement, 770.

Young Men, *Lectures to*, 56; their style and tone, 61; fitly delivered by ministers, 58; enlargement of the scope of ministerial teaching desirable, *ib.*; existing system of popular lecturing deficient, 59.

